

The Bologna Process: Does It Change the Nature of Political Science as a Discipline in Europe?

Erkki Berndtson

Department of Political Science
P.O.Box 54 (Unioninkatu 37)
00014 University of Helsinki, Finland
erkki.berndtson@helsinki.fi

Prepared for presentation at the ECPR Joint Sessions of Workshops, May 7-12, Helsinki, Finland (workshop on “Reforming Education Policy: Internationalization – Privatization-Governance”).

Political Science as an Organised Discipline

It is often argued that political science as an academic discipline was first established in the United States and that it was only after the Second World War, when politics was made a separate field of study at European universities. A recent collection of articles on the state of political science in Western Europe (Klingemann, ed. 2007) supports this argument. The discipline found its place in Europe indeed only after the Second World War: France (1945), Norway (1947), the Netherlands (1948), Germany (1949), Belgium (1951), Denmark (1958), Italy (1966), Switzerland (1969), Iceland (1970), Austria (1971), Portugal (1975), Spain (the late 1980s), Greece (1989) and Cyprus (1996). Only in Sweden (1877), the UK (the late 19th century), Ireland (1908) and Finland (1921) one could find a few professors in political science before the War. Even in Britain, however, “it was not until after World War II that politics was studied more widely at British universities” (Goldsmith and Grant 2007: 382). Furthermore, political science in Central and Eastern Europe is a post-socialist discipline, starting to develop only in the 1990s (Klingemann, Kulesza, Legutke, eds. 2002). It is also revealing that all the national political science associations in Europe have been founded after the War (except of the Finnish Political Science Association, which dates from 1935).

The history of the discipline in Europe is of course more complex than the dates above tell us. At the turn of the 20th century institutions of political science(s) were founded in many countries (Ecole Libre des Science Politiques in Paris in 1871, Facoltà di scienze politiche in Florence in 1874, the London School of Economics and Political Science in 1895, Deutsche Hochschule für Politik in Berlin in 1920 and a Higher School of Political Sciences in Athens in 1927). But these were institutions aimed to educate civil servants, diplomats and journalists with curricula comprising law, history, philosophy, economics and politics. The European development was also suppressed by Nazism and Fascism between the Wars as well as authoritarian systems still afterwards (Spain, Portugal).

It was no wonder that Quincy Wright, the first President of the International Political Science Association, wrote in 1949:

“One difficulty of course is that social science is a very recent growth and few people really believe in its possibilities. I was impressed at the recent meeting to form an International Political Science Association in Paris with the lack of political science associations in the world and the lack of belief among many people that a political science was possible. Really as disciplines seeking to utilize so far as possible the objective methods which have developed in the natural sciences, social science comes near to being an American phenomenon of the last fifty years. Little as there has been to spend on social sciences in the United States there has been infinitely more than in any other country. One of the tasks of the international associations in the social sciences therefore is to try to spread what we know about social science in the United States to the rest of the world” (Wright 1949).

As Europe was in ruins after the Second World War, American political science became influential in Europe in the 1950s. In Germany it was introduced by American occupation forces as the science of political re-education (Kastendiek 1987), in Italy it was used by reform-minded social scientists to advance social change (Graziano 1987) and for social scientists in many other countries, it offered a chance out of the old legalistic political culture. There was, however, no European political science community as such, as political scientists worked in their own national contexts. If European scholars met with each other, it was usually in the United States (see, Daalder, ed. 1997). It was not until 1970 when the European Consortium for Political Research (ECPR) was launched that

European political scientists began to cooperate at the European level (Berg-Schlusser 2006).

Because of the early development of political science as an academic discipline in the United States, it has sometimes been argued that political science is a distinctly American science (on this, see, e.g., Gunnell 2002). However, although a general pattern of disciplinary development is in many ways undisputable, it also hides essential aspects of history.

In many narratives of American political science, the founding of the School of Political Science at Columbia in 1880 has been taken as a symbolic beginning of the discipline (e.g., Crick 1959; Somit and Tanenhaus 1982). However, the School was organized much the same way as the *Ecole Libre des Sciences Politiques* in Paris. By the early 1890s the Columbia School had become the Faculty of Political Science with three internal administrative groupings, “Economics and Social Science”, “History and Political Philosophy,” and “Public Law and Comparative Jurisprudence”.¹

That is why it is more correct to say that the American study of politics as a discipline had much the same position as it had in Europe at the time. Anna Haddow (1939) has carefully studied the emergence of political science as an academic discipline in the United States from the 18th to the end of the 19th century. The teaching at the American colonial colleges was based on religion and ethics. Harvard, for instance, had a professorship of “Natural Religion, Moral Philosophy, and Civil Polity” (Haddow 1939: 57). On the other hand, the classical political philosophers were well known, as college courses included works by Burlamaqui, Grotius, Locke, Montesquieu, Publius (The Federalist), Rousseau and Vattel. Besides, Aristotle’s *Politics* seems to have been the basis for moral and political philosophy (Haddow 1939: 82).

¹ As was the case with the Columbia Faculty of Political Science itself, its journal *Political Science Quarterly* was a general social science journal devoted to “the Historical, Statistical and Comparative Study of Politics, Economics and Public Law”.

Law and political economy (with moral philosophy) had both received academic recognition as disciplines by 1825. In both subjects politics was part of the curriculum (e.g., governmental activity, public welfare). History was the fourth recognized discipline, but at that time it focused mainly on the history of Ancient Greece and Rome.

Between 1825 and 1865 relations between moral philosophy, law, political economy and history started to change, however. This was also a formative period of political science. Francis Lieber, who many consider the first real American political scientist (Farr 1990), had been nominated as Professor of History and Political Economy at South Carolina College in 1835. From South Carolina he was invited in 1857 to become a Professor at Columbia with the same title. He asked, however, that his professorship would be renamed as that of History and Political Science (Haddow 1939: 122-123; 138-140), although he was assigned to teach modern history, political science, natural and international law with civil and common law. In 1865 he became a Professor of Constitutional History and Public Law.

Lieber's example is typical of the mid 19th century American study of politics. Political science began to be recognized as an independent field of study, but its relations with other subjects were not yet clear. As moral philosophy started to concentrate on individual ethics, law to become a technical and analytic study of American law, and political economy to focus mainly on problems of production and distribution of goods, the study of politics had to reorient itself. In a new situation it and history came together, as historians' main interest had now turned into political and constitutional history. But as they turned to focus more on cultural, social and economic history, a time for a separate discipline of political science had come.

The American Political Science Association was founded in 1903. Many of those who took part in founding the Association felt that distinctly political problems required an association of their own. There was a need to devote attention particularly to problems of administration, legislation and constitutional and public law. As Westel Woodbury Willoughby, the first Secretary of the American Political Science Association wrote in

his 1904 Report of the Secretary, “In order to cover effectively the whole field of Political Science, the Association will distribute its work among sections, devoted respectively to such topics as International Law and Diplomacy, Comparative Legislation, Historical and Comparative Jurisprudence, Constitutional Law, Administration, Politics, and Political Theory (Willoughby 1904: 27).

With the founding of the Association the discipline began to gain its real identity and the launching of the *American Political Science Review* in 1906 became the final push in the disciplinary development, although a real distinctively American political science began to develop only after the First World War. In the interwar period American political science began to separate itself from constitutional history and other social sciences, although it was still organizationally linked to them². A new political science that emerged was critical of the old concepts of state and sovereignty, moved towards psychology, experimented with statistics and tried to imitate the natural sciences. It also introduced group dynamics and pluralism into the discipline’s vocabulary and talked about power and a need for a new theory of democracy (see, e.g., Gunnell 2007).

Until that time American and European study of politics had been quite similar to each other. The main difference between them was due to different organisational settings. The study of politics concentrated on problems of constitutional law and history, but in the United States it was carried out in social science departments, while especially on the Continental Europe it was part of law faculties. As Peter Wagner has written:

“First, the non-existence of political science at European academic institutions in the early 1900s was not due to the fact that nobody had tried to establish it. In contrast, the historical constellation of restructurations of the nation-states lent itself to such an interest, and movements for a political science emerged, which however, failed, Their failure can be explained to a considerable extent by the facts, second, that a drive towards ‘scientification’ in late-nineteenth-century universities bypassed political science, that no scientific language could be phrased, but that instead public law became the codified

² By 1914 there were 38 separate political science departments. Political science was also offered in 216 other departments with other disciplines: history (80), history and economics (48), economics and sociology (45), economics (22) and history, economics and sociology (21) (Anderson 1939: 263; cf. also, Ricci 1984: 61-62).

language in which to talk about the state; and third, that the existing demand for political-administrative professionals in the new states could to some extent be satisfied with exactly this formal legal training and, for the rest, was matched in professional schools whose orientations conflicted with those required for scientific discourses” (Wagner 2001: 26).

To understand the emergence of political science in Europe after the Second World War, it is important to emphasise three things. First, it was the interwar American political science, which was introduced in Europe and which became a model for a political science as an academic discipline. Secondly, as there were no political scientists to speak of, historians and legal scholars re-educated themselves as political scientists, as had been the case in the United States some fifty years earlier. And thirdly, the founding of a new academic discipline coincided with a structural transformation of European higher education.

Political Science and Structural Transformations in American Higher Education

In his study of the culture of academic disciplines, Tony Becher argues that academic disciplines are always difficult to define. What constitutes an academic discipline “will depend on the extent to which leading academic institutions recognize the hiving off in terms of their organizational structures” and “also on the degree to which a free-standing international community has emerged, with its own professional associations and specialist journals”. Disciplines are identified by the existence of academic departments, “but it does not follow that every department represents a discipline”. It is also a question of the legitimacy of departments in academia and “international currency is an important criterion, as is a general though not sharply-defined set of notions of academic credibility, intellectual substance, and appropriateness of subject matter” (Becher 1989: 19).

In this sense, academic disciplines also change over time and although it may be convenient sometimes to present disciplines as distinguishable and reasonably stable entities, some disciplines simply vanish, while some experience a steady evolution to new forms. There are also historical and geographical variations within disciplines. Different

“knowledge domains” have an impact on the identities and cultural characteristics of disciplines (Becher 1989: 19-20).

It is from this perspective that the past, present and future history of political science is analysed in this paper. The rise and fall of disciplines always takes place in the context of the structures of higher education, which on their part are moulded by the state (laws, resources) and/or other financiers (private economy). Structures, on the other hand, are shaped by ideologies, which are a product of cultural, economic and political factors, both domestic and international.

The development of a given discipline is dependent on the structures and ideologies of higher education. Within academic institutions, relations between disciplines are also important, as the existing ones are able to control the birth of new ones. All these factors lead to cyclical internal meta-theoretical discussions within disciplines, which shape the disciplinary practices. In this sense, the organisational and intellectual development of disciplines is dependent on the organization of the whole “knowledge production” (Berndtson 1991; Berg-Schlösser 2007: 410-411).

During the 19th century three higher education ideologies took developed in Europe (of these, see, Wittrock 1985). In the mid 19th century England, the idea of a general or liberal education gained ground as the “Newmanian” (John Henry Newman) principle on training good members of society. The British higher education ideology came to stress the general education of undergraduates with a certain detachment from the practical demands of society. Universities were to cultivate the mind, not to educate students for any specific profession.

When the “Newmanian” ideology focused on liberal education, the “Humboldtian” (Wilhelm von Humboldt) one in Germany emphasised teaching and learning together. From the founding of the new University of Berlin in 1809, the university was the place of true learning. It was self-administered by chaired professors, there was freedom and unity of teaching and learning and research was free of immediate social concerns.

The third ideology was the French “Napoleonic” model, according to which teaching and research came separated from each other. After the French revolution the old universities had been abolished (and they were not really restored until the late 19th century as loosely coordinated faculties). Instead, after the revolution and during “the Napoleonic reforms”, a system of elite professional education institutions was created in France. Research, on the other hand, was carried out in a number of extra-university institutions.

These three higher education ideologies have still their imprints on European higher education. They don’t exist in their pure forms anymore, but some of the characteristics of the original ideology of these models can still be seen in the three countries in question and even in many other countries, as they have been under the cultural influence of the European powers in question. One of the reasons, why these models do not exist any more in their original form, is the influence of the American university system after the Second World War. There has been an interactive process between Europe and the United States, as the “American system” initially developed out of the three European models in the late 19th century. As Björn Wittrock has written:

“...the rise of modern university-based research is not just the simple, sequential unfolding of one single tradition, notably the Humboldtian. Rather the rise to real prominence of the modern research university occurred in a setting characterized by the confluence of traditions of liberal education, professional education and research and research training, namely in the United States, where these different traditions did not exclude each other but were rather superimposed upon each other... Thus during a process extending over several decades in the late 19th and early 20th century, American higher education institutions came to include a group of strongly research-oriented universities, which, however, retained parts of an earlier Anglo-Saxon tradition of liberal undergraduate education as well as of a commitment to professional education” (Wittrock 1985: 16; 25).

A new American university relied on the idea of liberal education at the undergraduate level (the “Newmanian” model). At the same time it incorporated professional schools (the “Napoleonic” model”) into the university structure (law, business). A big step forward was, however, an introduction of the “Humboldtian” idea of the linkage between

research and teaching, which came to dominate the post-graduate work and led to the rise of big American research universities³.

An important new innovation in the American higher education was a system of departments, which contrasted with the German single-chair system, and gave better possibilities for the recognition of new disciplines (Wittrock 1985: 25). The formation of the departmental structure of the American university was created between 1890 and 1910, and at that time it was internationally unique. As Andrew Abbott has noted, this “departmental structure appeared only in American universities, although since mid-century it has gradually spread to Europe and elsewhere. Indeed, academic disciplines in the American sense – groups of professors with exchangeable credentials collected in strong associations – did not really appear outside the United States until well into the postwar period” (Abbott 2001: 122-123).

Departments stood between the individual professor and the university. The year 1869 has been seen as a turning-point in American higher education in this respect. Charles W. Eliot became then President of Harvard and introduced a new system of elective studies, which fostered a university with precise study fields. In 1876 Johns Hopkins was founded as a university concentrating on post-graduate research, which made departments even more desirable (Veysey 1965: 320-322). And in 1892 the University of Chicago was opened with the whole organisation based on departments.

Especially the model of the University of Chicago had a major influence on the structural transformation of the education. It was the first President of the University, William Rainey Harper, who initiated a new disciplinary system, which led to the formation of the departmental structure of the American university. The influence of the system grew, as

³ The German model has been seen as an important model for the restructuring of the American university system in the late 19th century as a first hand experience of the German university was brought home by hundreds of American students going to study at German universities after the Civil War (Haddow 1939: 172). Although this argument has its merits, it has to be specified as above (see also, Ash 2006: 46).

the University soon became a centre for research, raiding other universities to attract the biggest names and the most promising young scholars (Sealander 2003: 232-233).

Departments were also products of ambitious young scholars, as they wanted to create new disciplines out of the old sub-specialties of established disciplines. However, the stronger the departments grew, the better able they were to keep the sub-specialties attached to them. A saturation point was achieved soon and the birth of new departments slowed down considerably after the 1890s (Veysey 1865: 322). The link between departments and disciplines was further strengthened, as the departmentalization of the university coincided with the formation of national disciplinary associations (Abbott 2001: 126).

The model of American political science with its two important characters, separate departments and professional associations, has given the global study of politics much of its contemporary character. Alain C. Cairns refers to Edward Shils in describing the influence of the American system on Canadian political science:

“One of the major factors contributing to tension in Canada, as elsewhere, has been what Shils labels the institutionalization of the social sciences. By this term Shils refers to the creation of specific structures by means of which the intellectual activity of the particular discipline takes place, its intellectual products are disseminated, its standards are maintained, new recruits are socialized, and incentives and disincentives are systematically given to intellectual work in accordance with evolving criteria of quality. The relevant structures include courses, departments, libraries and undergraduate and graduate programmes which give recognition and support to particular disciplines. To these university aspects of structure must be added professional journals, learned societies, publishers, funding agencies. And the ‘invisible college’ of colleagues working on related problems who use these instrumentalities to coordinate their efforts and to transmit cues to each other, In these terms it is clear that political science is far more institutionalized in the United States than in any other country, a fact possessed of crucial intellectual consequences (Cairns 1975: 203).

The institutionalisation (and size) of the American political science has been an important factor in moulding political science communities everywhere. There has been no way of not taking the American political science into account. Its influence in Europe (and in the

rest of the world) has been due to the degree of its institutionalisation with structured programs, journals and strong associations.

Many factors caused the transformation of the American system of higher education during the late 19th century. The Morrill Act of 1862 was a starting point for the enlargement of the university system. The federal government acted for the first time in the field of education, giving aid to states which supported colleges with agricultural and mechanical instruction (Veysey 1965: 15). On the other hand, the economic growth after the Civil War created large business empires, whose owners channeled some of their money to philanthropy (Friedman and McGarvie, eds. 2003). This helped the rise of the research university tremendously, as private money was used to establish such first rate new universities as Cornell (with a gift from Ezra Cornell's Western Union stock), Johns Hopkins (a Baltimore business magnate), Stanford (railway magnate Leland Stanford) and the University of Chicago (funded by John D. Rockefeller, Sr.) (see, e.g., Ricci 1984: 33-34). The large fortunes of these "robber barons" were also placed under the control of foundations, which acted as intermediaries between business and universities.

The money had also its strings. University administrations and curricula had to be modernized, and in order to receive grants, universities had to accept corporate accounting techniques. It must be remembered that until the late 19th century, there were no real standards for entering into most professions in America. Many state legislatures had even banned examinations or licensing as undemocratic (Sealander 2003: 230).

With the expansion of universities, also student enrolments increased. When in 1890 there had been 173 000 students, in 1910 there were 332 000 (by 1939 the student enrolment had risen already to 1 350 000) (Anderson 1939: 259-260). This growth guaranteed also the further expansion of universities. More teaching staff was needed and this in itself strengthened the structure of the universities which had been created during the period of 1880-1910. The development continued after the Second World War, as the higher education became part of the post-war reconstruction in the United States and led to even more rapid growth in a number of universities and academic faculty. At this time

the structure of American university was exported all over the world through American foreign policy and with the financial help of American foundations (Berman 1980; Fisher 1980).

European Higher Education in the Age of Globalisation

From the 19th century to the 1970s higher education was considered as a national project of nation-states. After the “Golden Age” of the post-Keynesian welfare state in Europe (1950-1975), the university has now lost that position and it has increasingly become to be “viewed as merely part of the public sector and its traditional claims to social uniqueness (and consequently economic and political) uniqueness are increasingly falling on deaf ears” (Kwiek 2005: 4).

As Marek Kwiek (2005) has argued, the change must be seen in the light of the general discussion on the “welfare state crisis” since the late 1970s and as part of the globalisation process strengthening demands to restructure nation-states and the role of higher education. Globalisation incorporates the university into the service of the state in a new way, redefining the role of higher education. As part of national project the university was an instrument of political integration. In the age of globalisation it is to serve as part of the production process. This is reflected also in the structure of the university, as the corporate management is becoming its basic organisational model.

The “crisis of the welfare state” and ongoing globalisation processes set the context of universities today. There are many concrete problems and challenges which universities face. Some of them are partly due to the old structures and policies, some are caused by new external factors. Many of these factors are connected, but there is not necessarily any common logic in them. That is why demands on universities are often contradictory and produce unintentional outcomes. The old welfare state ideology, for instance, has led to an increased number of students (higher education becoming more and more a system of mass education), but the welfare state crisis has led to diminished resources in universities, governmental demands for efficiency and the increased rise of part-time

faculty. The globalisation process has emphasised changing needs of global labour market and free competition of education services (GATS), but the deepening European integration process still needs pan-European nationalism and the creation of a new “attractive” European Higher Education Area (Goldsmith and Berndtson 2002; cf. also, Levine 1997).

The European Commission’s Communication on *The Role of the Universities in the Europe of Knowledge* (2003) reveals well the basic understanding of the situation of the higher education in Europe among some of the key European decision makers. On the other hand, universities are seen as essential institutions for the future of Europe. At the same time it is complained that “European universities have gone through the second half of the 20th-century without really calling into question the role or the nature of what they should be contributing to society” (European Commission 2003, 22). Because universities have a duty to their “stakeholders” (students, public authorities funding universities, the labour market, society as a whole) to “maximise the social return of the investment” (Commission 2003, 14), it is now time for universities to change, because “the European universities are not at present globally competitive with those of our major (read: American, *E.B.*) partners” (European Commission 2003, 2).

In this situation the Commission has set three major objectives for the European Higher Education Area:

1. Ensuring that the European universities have sufficient and sustainable resources. It is acknowledged that the worsening under-funding of European universities makes it difficult to keep up high standards in teaching and research. As the total expenditure on higher education has not increased even in proportion to the growth in the number of students, it is also difficult to keep and attract the best talent. The funding of universities should not, however, be any more a sole duty of the public sector (as it cannot afford it). The universities have to find new sources of income, e.g., by developing effective and close forms of co-operation with industry and/or by introducing tuition fees in the countries which still don’t have them. As the demand for higher education will increase

in the future, universities have also to find ways to use the available financial resources more efficiently.

2. Consolidating the excellence of European universities. One has to create right conditions for developing European centres and networks of excellence. It will be important to identify the areas in which different universities are excellent and to fund them accordingly. The proliferation of places where knowledge is produced becomes also essential, as it is important to create conditions for a symbiotic relationship between universities and society. The new knowledge is often produced in co-operation between “producers” and “consumers”. *To understand modern problems the old academic disciplines have to change, as there is an increasing need to develop interdisciplinary capability of scholars (italics, E.B.).* Universities need long term planning as well as efficient management structures and practices. As managing a modern university has become a complex business, management of universities should be opened to professionals from outside the academic world, incorporating non-academics within universities’ management and governance structures.

3. Broadening the perspective of European universities. The internationalisation of education and research leads to increased competition between universities. The problem is that especially in comparison with American universities, European universities are less attractive, as “financial, material and working conditions are not as good”. This is an area where much needs to be done, although the Commission does not find any real solutions to the problem. Another important perspective to European universities is to become more closely involved in community life. There are new expectations for the role of universities at the local and regional level. Universities must become a forum of reflection on knowledge, debate and dialogue between academics and citizens.

The views of the European Commission reveal a vision of one possible future for the European universities. This vision is strengthened by governments and business making demands for efficiency (concentration on excellence, bringing in outside managers, evaluation of teaching and research), for outside funding (relations with business,

fulfilling local and regional needs, proliferation of universities) and for the reorganisation of knowledge (interdisciplinarity). These demands are also strengthened by students who demand more labour market relevant teaching and study flexibility (students as consumers, growing individualism in studies, students working half or full time).

But there has hardly been any real acknowledgment of problems within universities which the faculty faces every day. As was pointed out already, resources have become scarce, student numbers have increased, as has the use of part-time staff in teaching. Besides, new administrative demands and pressure on teaching have led to diminished research opportunities.

At the same time, universities have become more “efficient”. They have “produced” more and more people with an academic degree. However, this has led to other problems. Going to college has become mainly a defensive necessity, as “most of the jobs now held by college graduates in sales, transportation, services and even the computer industry could be performed successfully by people with little or no higher education” (Clausen 2006: 33). New PhDs have the most difficult situation at the labour market. As there is an oversupply of PhDs in most countries, it has become very difficult for many to find work to which they have been educated, especially in the humanities and the social sciences (Goldsmith, ed. 2005).

The Bologna Process as a European Solution

The Bologna Process can be seen as a project to answer the problems, which political and economic elites have defined in order to restructure the European higher education according to the needs of global competition in a world of diminishing resources. On the other hand, the Bologna is also a project to harmonise European higher education⁴ and to strengthen the idea of European citizenship. As was hinted above, these two goals may sometimes be at odds with each other. For instance, as one of the original principles of

⁴ It is interesting that although the Sorbonne Declaration (1998), which set the tone for the Bologna Declaration of the next year, had a title “Joint Declaration on Harmonisation of the Architecture of the European Higher Education System”, the word “harmonisation” does not appear in the documents of the Bologna Process.

the Bologna has been to increase student and staff mobility between European universities, the Commission seems to view the mobility mainly as a way to create European identity. As to the Erasmus programme, the Commission's view is that "Support for Mobility is one of the pillars of the programme. The Commission nonetheless regrets that the decision to establishing the programme has included mobility amongst its objectives, as mobility should evidently have been envisaged not as an end in itself, but as a means primarily intended to develop European citizenship" (European Commission, 2002: 9).

It is possible to argue that one shouldn't link the European Commission and the Bologna Process too closely together, as the Process was initiated by national governments, first by the British, French, German and Italian ministers meeting at Sorbonne, and then by 29 ministers in Bologna, and the Commission was accepted as a partner in the process only at the Prague follow-up meeting in 2001. Although this argument is formally correct, it hides more than reveals about the nature of the Bologna.

The Bologna Process is a process, where national policies, policies of the European Union and continuing negotiations between different actors (Ministries of education, the Commission, the Council, and "other relevant actors"⁵) constantly interact with each other (Keeling 2004). In that sense, it is a difficult process to study. However, the Commission's funding helped the preparation of the Bologna meeting and after Prague many thematic interests of the Commission have been included in the Process (e.g., lifelong learning) (Balzer and Martens 2004: 14-15). Moreover, of the original six principles of the Bologna Declaration: 1) readable and comparable degrees, 2) a system based on two main cycles, 3) a common system of credits, 4) promotion of mobility, 5) quality assurance, and 6) European dimensions in teaching, most of them have been on the agenda of the European Commission already well before the Bologna. As Carolin Balzer and Kerstin Martens have written:

⁵ Especially the E4-group, the European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA), the National Unions of Students in Europe (ESIB), the European University Association (EUA) and the European Association of Institutions in Higher Education (EURASHE).

“None of these goals (except the system of two cycles) of Bologna, however, are new or have not been addressed by the European Commission in previous years. Rather, Bologna can even be understood as very important in mainstreaming many of the activities the Commission has been trying to do for the last 15 years” (Balzer and Martens 2004: 12).

A common system of credits and the promotion of mobility have, indeed, been on the agenda of the European Commission since the 1980s⁶. The demand for comparability of degrees may be seen as corollary of these. On the other hand, the European dimension is the basic approach of the European Union in everything. The Commission has also been active in introducing the idea of the Quality Assurance approaches for the European higher education as part of the global ideology promoted by international organizations, such as, OECD and the World Bank (see, Kauko 2007)⁷.

It is, indeed, only a two-tier degree structure, which seems to have emerged through the work of inter-governmental conferences. Maybe one of the reasons for this is that the principle is more directly linked with national competitiveness and the needs of the labour market as are the other Bologna principles. Governments all over Europe want students to graduate faster in the era of diminishing resources⁸.

To evaluate the success of the Bologna Process thus far is difficult, as the Process moves with different speed around Europe. The majority of countries have already restructured their degree structures after the Bologna model, but national varieties still exist. In some countries the process is still at the beginning (e.g., Austria, Greece), some countries think that they already have the degree structure that is expected from them (Ireland, the UK), and some countries have done mostly cosmetic changes (e.g., Italy, see, Capano 2002).

⁶ The mobility was also one of the key issues in the Magna Charta Universitatum, a declaration given by rectors of European universities in Bologna in 1988 (Reinalda and Kulesza 2006: 7-8).

⁷ The Council of Ministers of Education adopted also already in 1998 a *Recommendation on European cooperation in quality assurance in higher education* (Reinalda and Kulesza 2006: 45).

⁸ This may be also a reason why most European countries have now adopted a 3+2+3 model for the degree structure (of the current situation, see, Klingemann 2007: 26). The Bologna Declaration states only that “access to the second cycle shall require successful completion of first cycle studies, lasting a *minimum* of three years” (italics, *E.B.*). It is interesting that the 3+2+3 model originates from the French Attali Report of 1998, which has no direct link to the Bologna Process. It came out just before the Sorbonne Declaration and somehow came to be linked with that Declaration and the Bologna.

There is also still a lot of passive resistance within the European academia (see, e.g., Schüttemeyer 2007: 166).

The introduction of the quality assurance mechanisms seem to follow the same pattern. On the other hand, in those countries in which the system has been introduced, its impact on the academic work has been noticeable, “‘Quality Assurance’ is the new buzzword. Considerable efforts are being devoted to participate in the European Network of Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA) activities and to develop operational measures of quality assurance” (Denmark, Pedersen 2007: 89), “probably the greatest impact on the system has been in the area Quality Assurance/ Quality Improvement (QA/QI)” (The Netherlands, Reinalda 2007: 279), and “quality assurance was made an important part of the reform” (Norway, Hansen 2007: 299).

The third key principle, mobility, has already for a long time functioned outside the Bologna Process. The Erasmus student exchange has developed steadily over the years. From the modest beginning of 3244 students participating in the programme during its first academic year 1987-88, a number of exchange students has climbed well over 100 000 annually (there were 144 037 students in the exchange during 2004-05)⁹. The Commission would still like to increase the annual number of students studying in a foreign university to 375 000 (European Commission 2004: 17), although even a present level of student exchange is not without its problems (Berndtson, ed. 2005).

A new degree structure, quality assurance mechanisms and the mobility scheme are the three central principles of the Bologna¹⁰. As the main argument of this paper is that the Bologna process must not be understood only as a technical transformation of the higher education system in Europe, but that it has also an important impact on the nature and contents of academic disciplines, including political science (cf., Klingemann 2007: 15), this argument must now be specified.

⁹ On the other hand, the Commission has been disappointed with the teacher mobility under the Erasmus programme. Academic faculty is not very keen on going to teach in a foreign university.

¹⁰ Readability and comparability of degrees, the ECTS system and a European dimension in teaching are also important, but they can be seen as corollaries of the main three principles.

European Political Science Today

It is important to remember, that the introduction of political science as an academic discipline in Europe happened after the Second World War. The American disciplinary system with independent departments and scientific associations became part of European higher education and research system in the growth period of the welfare state (1950–1975). Student numbers increased also in Europe, which, together with the American influence began to change the old higher education ideologies and structures. American universities increasingly attracted European scholars as the best in the world.

The European study of politics also found a fertile ground in American political science, because new kind of information on politics was desperately needed in post-War Europe. The legacy of the war had to be understood and there was a need for large-scale social reforms. But this “Americanisation” of the study of politics has never been complete. The development of the discipline of political science has been a complex and uneven process. European political science is still understood in different ways in different cultures. When American political science is *science*, many British scholars prefer to use the concept of political studies, and the French still talk about political sciences. Besides, the borders of the discipline are often fuzzy. In some countries international relations forms a discipline of its own and in some others the study of public administration has transformed itself into a science of management.

A recent book on the state of political science in Western Europe (Klingemann, ed. 2007) is a good example of differences among European political science communities concerning research areas and intellectual traditions. There are political science communities which are oriented towards empirical Anglo-American political science (mainly political scientists in Northern Europe and in some Central and Eastern European countries), there are policy-oriented scholarly communities (the Netherlands, Germany,

Sweden), sociologically oriented ones (France, Spain) and those with a strong connection to political philosophy (Italy)¹¹.

However, a certain “European political science tradition” may be found by focusing on American and European disciplinary practices. First, it is sometimes claimed that, “European political science, faced by the great diversity mentioned above, is by necessity more historically-oriented, more comparative, more macro-sociological in the Rokkanian tradition than its American counterpart” (Berg-Schloser 2007: 415). When American political scientists have been more keen to use quantitative methods and identify themselves with research traditions imitating natural sciences, such as, behaviouralism or rational choice, European political scientists have leaned more on qualitative methods, such as, historical and discourse analyses or the study of symbols (see, Klingemann 2007: 30). Bernard Crick’s (1959) famous argument that political science is a peculiarly American science must be understood in this light¹².

Secondly, a strong quantitative orientation and attempts at formal modeling in American political science are at least partly due to the social position of American political scientists and their disciplinary professionalisation. Social science disciplines are important for American intellectuals, because the American market for public intellectuals is incapable of supporting more than few non-academic writers. For many intellectuals the academia is the only practical recourse, which in its turn requires a membership of a specific academic discipline. Disciplines “provide the core identity for the vast majority of intellectuals in modern America” (Abbott 2001: 130).

¹¹ In spite of that a certain convergence of research areas seems to be developing, mainly in the study of the European Union and European politics. It is remarkable how the study of the European Union politics has increased during the last two decades all over Europe. This has happened partly through the support of the European Union. There were 46 Jean Monnet Chairs at European universities in 1990, 249 in 1995, 493 in 2000 and the figure had climbed to 623 in 2005 (Klingemann 2007: 30).

¹² One must emphasise that this difference between American and European political science must be understood in relative terms. There are many European political scientists, who have argued for the “scientific” study of politics, even before Crick’s book (Gunnell 2006: 139-140).

As American intellectuals are disciplinary intellectuals, their future is in science. This produces a world of its own, which doesn't even have to think about society outside the academia. As Giovanni Sartori wrote some time ago, "American-type political science (to be sure the "normal science," for intelligent scholars are always saved by their intelligence) is going nowhere, it is an ever growing giant with feet of clay....read to believe, the illegible and/or massively irrelevant *American Political Science Review*. The alternative ... is to resist the quantification of the discipline. Briefly put, *think before counting*; and also, *use logic* in thinking" (Sartori 2004: 786).

Instead, European political scientists have always had closer relations with politicians and "the influential" than their American colleagues (there are exceptions again, of course). In many European countries political scientists are still able to influence politics through their contacts in society (this seems to be the case especially in Eastern and Central Europe). As Philippe C. Schmitter has noted, "I do not think it exaggerated to claim that, while American political scientists see their task as exclusively 'professional', their European counterparts see it as equally 'intellectual'" (Schmitter 2002: 29).

The Effects of the Bologna on Political Science

Hans-Dieter Klingemann has recently raised the question, "why is the Bologna Process so important for teaching?" According to him, it is because of the identity problem of political scientists: what should a political scientist know in order to be recognized as a political scientist? (Klingemann 2007: 25).

European political scientists tried to answer the question at the time of the Berlin follow-up Conference in 2003. In the name of The European Conference of National Political Science Associations, a document "*The Bologna Declaration and the basic requirements of a Bachelor of Arts (BA) in Political Science in Europe. Recommendations from the European Conference of National Political Science Associations*" (The European Conference of National Political Science Associations 2003)¹³ was sent to participants at the Berlin Conference. It was proposed that the amount of political science studies should

¹³ The document was an outcome of a lively debate among European political scientists. The final document was based on some preparatory papers, which all can be found in, Reinalda and Kulesza 2006.

in a BA degree be at least half (i.e., 90 ECTS credits) and these should consist of the core subject areas of:

- Political Theory/History of Political Ideas
- Methodology (including statistics)
- Political system of one's own country and of the European Union
- Comparative Politics
- International Relations
- Public Administration and Policy Analysis
- Political Economy/ Political Sociology

In the sense, the Document was a defense of political science as a discipline in the changing context of the European higher education, “we have to respond and to some extent defend ourselves against potential and real threats resulting from the radical changes in Higher Education now sweeping across Europe...in this process of reform we have the opportunity to promote political science as a discipline, indeed I would say as one of the three core social science disciplines” (Furlong 2007: 402).

The Bologna Process seems actually to harmonise European political science and to strengthen its disciplinary system. In that sense, it may function as a further continuation of the “Americanisation” of European study of politics. This can be seen by looking at the three key areas of the Bologna Declaration: degree structure, quality assurance and mobility.

A new 3+2 model seems to require more planning for studies, than was the case in the “old” system. Major subjects have become more important in a three-year Bachelor's degree, as the example of the political scientists' document testifies. A disciplinary structure is also strengthened by the Bologna Declaration's promotion of quality assurance mechanisms. The quality is measured as a quality of disciplines and departments. The pan-European quality agencies are also bound to use English as their working language (see, ENQA's website, for instance), which directs departments to present themselves through criteria developed in the American and British academic cultures (Kauppi 2007). And finally, student exchange demands that studies taken in a foreign university must easily fit into the curriculum of one's home university and they

must be easily measured. Readability and comparability of degrees would of course be easier to carry into effect, if disciplines would have a core curriculum.

If the principles of the Bologna Declaration really strengthen the disciplinary nature of European political science, it is interesting, that this development is in contradiction with the policy statements of the Commission. The ideology of the restructuring of the European higher education supports the idea of interdisciplinarity (cf. the Commission's demand, that "*to understand modern problems the old academic disciplines have to change, as there is an increasing need to develop interdisciplinary capability of scholars*", p. 14 above). It is, however, nearly impossible to carry out interdisciplinarity in the context of strong disciplines.

Interdisciplinarity is an old idea. When the disciplinary structure was created in American universities, one of its problems was that it separated different social spheres (economy, politics, civil society) from each other. Foundations tried to correct this by emphasising the need for interdisciplinarity in the social sciences. This was one of the policies of the Social Science Research Council (founded in 1923), as well as a key element in the programme of behaviouralism in the 1950s (Berndtson 1997). The problem has been, however, that after the disciplinary system had been created, disciplines have developed into bureaucratic institutions of their own, competing against each other. In spite of repeated arguments for interdisciplinarity in the social sciences, the idea has not advanced in any real sense.

Disciplines continue to frame scientific practice within them, even as political science has been developing into a fragmented scholarly enterprise from the late 1960s on. There are many examples of that. J. Tobin Grant, for instance, has pointed out that, "political scientists have organized themselves so that they are more related to other political scientists who study similar events and concepts, not to those who study politics in a similar ways" (Grant 2005: 384). Grant finds concentrations of political scientists in different groups, the horizon being dominated by three areas of concentration: comparative politics, a collection of interdisciplinary scholars and American politics

scholars. The other areas of concentration are political methodology, public administration, public policy, international relations and political philosophy. At the same time, most universities have departments, such as, urban studies, gender studies, peace and conflict studies, etc. All these developments have created “concerns about what, exactly, defines the discipline internally and in terms of its understanding of its cognitive and practical relationship to its subject matter” (Gunnell 2002: 352).

There are, however, logical reasons, why interdisciplinarity has not really advanced in academia. First, a demand for it is generally problem-driven and social problems have their own life cycle. Besides, there are so many more social problems than there are existing departments that a university organised around social problems would be hopelessly fragmented. Problem-based knowledge is too abstract to be really able to compete with a problem-portable knowledge of existing disciplines (Abbott 2001: 134-135).

Secondly, it is difficult to change existing structures of disciplines, as they fulfill key academic functions. Disciplines legitimate our necessarily partial knowledge. It is not possible to be an expert on everything, so disciplinary structures legitimate what there is to know (Abbott 2001: 130). Besides:

“The extraordinary resilience of the American system of academic disciplines lies in this dual institutionalization. On the one hand, the disciplines constitute the macrostructure of the labor market for faculty Careers remain within discipline much more than within university ... On the other hand, the system constitutes the microstructure of each individual university. All arts and sciences faculties contain more or less the same list of departments. This duality means that no university can challenge the disciplinary system as a whole without depriving its Ph.D. graduates of their academic future” (Abbott 2001: 126).

If disciplines will become stronger and more harmonised due to the Bologna Process, does it have any other effect on the future of European political science? This is of course a matter of speculation, but there are reasons to believe, that political science research will be a victim. It is often argued that a three-year Bachelor's degree is not enough to give a solid education in political science. In many European countries, a new degree

means a narrower degree than the old one was (Hansen 2007: 299). Although this may not matter in the labour market, it has consequences for research. The research skills of Ph.D. students will not be what they used to be¹⁴ and their knowledge of other social sciences will be inadequate.

Another danger concerns the division of labour within universities. As universities have developed into mass education institutions, this development has been most visible in the social sciences and humanities, one of the reasons being that the cost of education is very low in these fields compared to hard sciences. In this situation a three-year Bachelor's degree may develop into a degree "for masses" and the Master's degree will be "for an elite" (which seems already to be happening in some countries, see, Capano 2002, 87). If the first cycle of studies will develop into an intensified form of mass education, it will then have an effect on research opportunities in universities. Teaching and research personnel will more and more grow apart, especially as the lack of public funding compels universities to look increasingly for outside research funds.

And thirdly, quality assurance with "international standards" leads scholars to write mainly in English. This will make political scientists more "professional" in the way American political science has become professionalised. The institutionalisation of disciplines in Europe has already brought with it practices and standards used in American academia, i.e., norms with regard to how disciplines should be practiced and the fetish attached to peer-reviewed articles in journals (Schmitter 2002: 31). All this will diminish the impact of political scientists in their own countries, especially, if they neglect to write in their own languages in their own political contexts.

This leads to the problem of how the study of politics should be organised. Politics is one of the core social processes and it has always been studied. Until the disciplinary structure was founded in the United States during the turn of the 20th century, politics had been studied as part of other social processes. Should this be the case again? Many

¹⁴ Already the requirements for doctoral theses in many countries have been lowered (see, Goldsmith, ed. 2005).

Europeans have been wondering, what to do with the disciplinary structure. Writing on Bernard Crick's *The American Science of Politics*, the early critic of American political science, Michael Kenny notes that, "the implications of his thinking for the question of whether and how the study of politics should be institutionalised within the modern university, remained frustratingly elusive. If it was a mistake to found an independent discipline on a par with the natural sciences, where exactly should political studies be located intellectually? And how should it manage its borders and relations with neighbouring subjects – history, philosophy, law?" (Kenny 2006: 159).

These are still good questions and there are no simple answers to them. On the other hand, it must be remembered that there are still countries in which political science is understood as political sciences. In regard to France, for instance, "French political scientists find their scientific serenity with difficulty, for they constantly encounter philosophers, sociologists, and historians who publicly announce their own claim to talk about politics and to talk about it with incomparably greater explanatory power" (Favre 1982: 164).

Although the situation has changed during the last twenty years and political scientists seem to have found their place in the French society (Blondiaux and Déloye 2007), the meaning of the quotation is to point out that politics can, indeed, be studied also from other perspectives than that of "political science". Political science as political sciences would mean that the study of politics would be more loosely organised and political scientists would be working in close cooperation with sociologists, historians, philosophers, etc. This model has worked in the French Institutes of Political Studies (IEPs), so it would not be an impossible solution¹⁵. It may be, however, that even the

¹⁵ Some political scientists seem to be afraid of this solution, however, as it has been wondered, if small political science departments are able to adopt the new 3+2 degree structure, as their teaching capacity is small and they cannot create BA or MA courses in political science alone, which means that small departments should organise courses with other departments with only a remote resemblance with political science. This is seen as constituting a possible danger to the identity of political science as a discipline (Schüttemeyer 2007: 166-167).

French political science is now moving to the direction of “political science” as a result of the harmonising effects of the Bologna Process and there are no real alternatives left.

All these developments and tendencies indicate that the Bologna Process is not only a technical project restructuring the European higher education area. It is a complex set of different ideas, which will produce a profound effect also on the nature of existing academic disciplines (especially social sciences). If the Bologna process changes the way we study politics, it may well change also what we know about politics.

References

Abbott, Andrew (2001). *Chaos of Disciplines*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Anderson, William (1939). *Political Science Enters the Twentieth Century*, in Anna Haddow, *Political Science in American Colleges and Universities 1636-1900*. New York and London: D. Appleton-Century Company, 257-266.

Ash, Mitchell G. (2006). *The Humboldt Illusion*. *The Wilson Quarterly*, Autumn 2006, 45-48.

Balzer, Carolin and Martens, Kerstin (2004). *International Higher Education and the Bologna Process. What Part Does the European Commission Play?* Paper prepared for presentation at the epsNet Plenary Conference, Prague, June 18-19, 2004.

Becher, Tony (1989). *Academic Tribes and Territories. Intellectual Enquiry and the Cultures of Disciplines*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

Berg-Schlosser, Dirk (2006). *Political Science in Europe: Diversity, Excellence, relevance*. *European Political Science* 5:2, 163-170.

Berg-Schlosser, Dirk (2007). *European Political Science – The Role of the European Consortium for Political Research (ECPR)*, in Hans-Dieter Klingemann (ed.), *The State of Political Science in Western Europe*. Opladen & Farmington Hills: Barbara Budrich Publishers, 409-415.

Berman, Edward (1989). *The Foundations’ Role in American Foreign Policy: The Case of Africa, post 1945*, in Robert F. Arnove (ed.), *Philanthropy and Cultural Imperialism. The Foundations at Home and Abroad*. Boston: G.K. Hall & Co., 203-232.

- Berndtson, Erkki (1991). The Development of Political Science. Methodological Problems of Comparative Research, in David Easton, John G. Gunnell and Luigi Graziano (eds.), The Development of Political Science. London and New York: Routledge, 34-58.
- Berndtson, Erkki (1997). Behavioralism. Origins of the Concept. Paper prepared for presentation at the XVIIth IPSA World Congress, Seoul, August 17-21, 1997.
- Berndtson, Erkki, ed. (2005). Mobile Europe. Improving Faculty and Student Mobility Conditions in Europe. epsNet Reports #9. Paris.
- Blondiaux, Loïc and Déloye, Yves (2007). The Current State of Political Science: Report on the Situation in France, in Hans-Dieter Klingemann (ed.), The State of Political Science in Western Europe. Opladen & Farmington Hills: Barbara Budrich Publishers, 137-162.
- Bologna Declaration (1999). The European Higher Education Area. Joint Declaration of the European Ministers of Education. Convened in Bologna on the 19th of June 1999.
- Cairns, A.C. (1975). Political Science in Canada and the Americanization Issue. Canadian Journal of Political Science 8:2, 191-234.
- Capano, Giliberto (2002). Implementing the Bologna Declaration in Italian Universities. European Political Science 1:3, 81-91.
- Clausen, Christopher (2006). The New Ivory Tower. The Wilson Quarterly, Autumn 2006, 31-36.
- Crick, Bernard (1959). The American Science of Politics. Its Origins and Conditions. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Daalder, Hans, ed. (1997). Comparative European Politics. The Story of the Profession. London and New York: Pinter.
- European Commission (2002) Final Commission Report on the Implementation of the Socrates Programme 1995-1999. Brussels, available http://europa.eu/int/comm/education/programmes/evaluation/rap_en.pdf, accessed 25 March 2005.
- European Commission (2003). The Role of the Universities in the Europe of Knowledge. COM (2003) 58 Final. Brussels, 05.02.2003.
- European Commission (2004). The New Generation of Community Education and Training Programmes after 2006. Brussels, 9.3.2004. COM (2004) 156 final, available http://europa.eu.int/eur-lex/eu/com/cnc/2004com2004_0156en01.pdf, accessed 15 January 2005.

Favre, Pierre (1982). France, in W.G. Andrews (ed.), *International Handbook of Political Science*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 154-168.

Fisher, Donald (1980). American Philanthropy and the Social Sciences: The Reproduction of a Conservative Ideology, in Robert F. Arnove (ed.), *Philanthropy and Cultural Imperialism. The Foundations at Home and Abroad*. Boston: G.K. Hall & Co, 233-268.

Friedman, Lawrence J. and McGarvie, Mark D., eds. (2003). *Charity, Philanthropy, and Civility in American History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Furlong, Paul (2007). The European Conference of National Political Science Associations: Problems and Possibilities of Co-operation, in Hans-Dieter Klingemann (ed.), *The State of Political Science in Western Europe*. Opladen & Farmington Hills: Barbara Budrich Publishers, 401-407.

Goldsmith, Michael (2005). *Doctoral Studies in Political Science – A European Comparison*. epsNet Reports #10. Paris.

Goldsmith, Mike and Berndtson, Erkki (2002). Teaching Challenges for Political Science in Europe. *European Political Science* 1:3, 69-80.

Goldsmith, Michael and Grant, Wyn (2007). British Political Science in the New Millennium, in Hans-Dieter Klingemann (ed.), *The State of Political Science in Western Europe*. Opladen & Farmington Hills: Barbara Budrich Publishers, 381-398.

Grant, J. Tobin (2005). What Divides Us? The Image and Organization of Political Science. *PS: Political Science and Politics* 38:3, 379-386.

Graziano, Luigi (1987). The Development and Institutionalization of Political Science in Italy. *International Political Science Review* 8:1, 41-57.

Gunnell, John G. (2002). Handbooks and History: Is It Still the *American* Science of Politics? *International Political Science Review* 23:4, 339-354.

Gunnell, John G. (2006). The European Geneses of American Political Science. *European Political Science* 5:2, 137-149.

Gunnell, John G. (2007). Making Democracy Safe for the World: Political Science between the Wars, in Robert Adcock, Mark Bevir, and Shannon C. Stimson (eds.), *Modern Political Science. Anglo-American Exchanges Since 1880*. Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 137-157.

Haddow, Anna (1939). *Political Science in American Colleges and Universities 1636-1900*. New York and London: D. Appleton-Century Company.

Hansen, Tore (2007). Norwegian Political Science, in Hans-Dieter Klingemann (ed.), *The State of Political Science in Western Europe*. Opladen & Farmington Hills: Barbara Budrich Publishers, 295-309.

Kastendiek, Hans (1987). Political Development and Political Science in West Germany. *International Political Science Review* 8:1, 25-40.

Kauko, Jaakko (2007). The Institutionalisation of Quality Assurance in European Higher Education. To be published, in Erkki Berndtson (ed.), *European Approaches to Quality Assurance in Teaching Political Science: Who Gets What, When, How*.

Kauppi, Niilo (2007). Political Science Quality as English-language Quantity. To be published, in Erkki Berndtson (ed.), *European Approaches to Quality Assurance in Teaching Political Science: Who Gets What, When, How*.

Kenny, Michael (2006). Neither Anglo nor America: The Implications of the American Science of Politics for the History of Political Science. *European Political Science* 5:2, 150-162.

Keeling, Ruth (2004). Locating Ourselves in the 'European Higher Education Area': Investigating the Bologna Process in Practice. Paper prepared for presentation at the epsNet Plenary Conference, Prague, June 18-19, 2004.

Klingemann, Hans-Dieter (2007). A Comparative Perspective on Political Science in Western Europe around the Year 2005, in Hans-Dieter Klingemann (ed.), *The State of Political Science in Western Europe*. Opladen & Farmington Hills: Barbara Budrich Publishers, 13-40.

Klingemann, Hans-Dieter, ed. (2007). *The State of Political Science in Western Europe*. Opladen & Farmington Hills: Barbara Budrich Publishers.

Klingemann, Hans-Dieter, Kulesza, Ewa and Legutke, Annette, eds. (2002). *The State of Political Science in Central and Eastern Europe*. Berlin: Edition Sigma.

Kwiek, Marek (2005). Renegotiating the Traditional Social Contract? The University and the State in a Global Age. ECER Keynote Address, Dublin, Sept. 9, 2005.

Levine, Arthur (1997). How the Academic Profession is Changing, *Daedalus* 126:4, 1-20.

Pedersen, Mogens N. (2007). Denmark: Political Science – Past, Present and Future, in Hans-Dieter Klingemann (ed.), *The State of Political Science in Western Europe*. Opladen & Farmington Hills: Barbara Budrich Publishers, 87-102.

Reinalda, Bob (2007). The Current State of Political Science in the Netherlands, in Hans-Dieter Klingemann (ed.), *The State of Political Science in Western Europe*. Opladen & Farmington Hills: Barbara Budrich Publishers, 275-294.

Reinalda, Bob and Kulesza, Ewa (2006). *The Bologna Process – Harmonizing Europe’s Higher Education*. Opladen & Farmington Hills: Barbara Budrich Publishers.

Ricci, David M. (1984). *The Tragedy of Political Science: Politics, Scholarship, and Democracy*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Sartori, Giovanni (2004). *Where Is Political Science Going? PS: Political Science and Politics* 37:4, 785-786.

Schmitter, Philippe C. (2002). *Seven (Disputable) Theses Concerning the Future of ‘Transatlanticised’ or ‘Globalised’ Political Science*. *European Political Science* 1:2, 23-40.

Schüttemeyer, Suzanne S. (2007). *The Current State of Political Science in Germany*, in Hans-Dieter Klingemann (ed.), *The State of Political Science in Western Europe*. Opladen & Farmington Hills: Barbara Budrich Publishers, 163-186.

Sealander, Judith (2003). *Curing Evils at Their Source: The Arrival of Scientific Giving*, in Lawrence J. Friedman and Mark D. McGarvie (eds), *Charity, Philanthropy, and Civility in American History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 217-239.

Somit, Albert and Joseph Tanenhaus (1982). *The Development of American Political Science. From Burgess to Behavioralism*. New York: Irvington Publishers, Inc.

Sorbonne Declaration (1998). *Joint Declaration on Harmonisation of the Architecture of the European Higher Education System*, Paris, the Sorbonne, May 25, 1998.

Veysey, Laurence R. (1965). *The Emergence of the American University*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Wagner, Peter (2001). *A History and Theory of the Social Sciences*. London: SAGE.

Willoughby, Westel Woodbury (1904). *Report of the Secretary for the Year 1904*. *Proceedings of of the American Political Science Association*. Vol 1, 27-32.

Wittrock, Björn (1985). *Before the dawn...Humanism and Technocracy in University Research Policy*, in Björn Wittrock and Aant Elzinga (eds.), *The University Research System. The Public Policies of the Home of Scientists*. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International, 1-37.

Wright, Quincy (1949). *A Letter to Roy F. Nichols, 9 November 1949*. Quincy Wright Papers, Joseph Regenstein Library, Department of Special Collections, University of Chicago.

The Bologna Process is a series of ministerial meetings and agreements between European countries to ensure comparability in the standards and quality of higher-education qualifications. The process has created the European Higher Education Area under the Lisbon Recognition Convention. It is named after the University of Bologna, where the Bologna declaration was signed by education ministers from 29 European countries in 1999. The process was opened to other countries in the European Cultural 4 RECEP The Russian-European Centre for Economic Policy (RECEP) was established as a project in 1995, and continued under four two-year phase public procurement contracts until In 2004, the fifth phase of the project was launched. RECEP is a project providing technical assistance to the Russian Federation government. Thus, the Bologna process is closely connected to Europe s strive for strengthening also its economic competitiveness in the pressure of globalization. Under the Bologna Process, European governments engage in discussions regarding higher education policy reforms and strive to overcome obstacles to create a European Higher Education Area. Bologna reform is key to building the necessary trust for successful learning mobility, cross-border academic cooperation and the mutual recognition of study periods and qualifications earned abroad. The Bologna Process also provides a forum for dialogue with neighbouring countries regarding higher education reforms and questions related to shared academic principles, such as the independence of universities and the participation of students in civil society activities. What is the EU doing to support higher education reform? Since the launch of the The Bologna Process is a European reform process aiming at establishing a European Higher Education Area by 2010. It is an unusual process in that it is loosely structured and driven by the 46 countries participating in it in cooperation with a number of international organisations, including the Council of Europe. This probably did not really answer the question. It comes down to the following: By 2010 higher education systems in European countries should be organised in such a way that: it is easy to move from one country to the other (within the European Higher Education Area) for the pur