

ProSEPS WG1 meeting, 15-16 March 2018, Lisbon (ICS-UL), Portugal.

Day 1.

Session 1 (morning). Revisiting the list of political science positions.

Participants introduce themselves. WG1 is pleased to welcome new participants from Austria and Sweden and new members of national teams from Slovakia and Portugal who were unable to attend previous meetings.

A first list of political scientists in Europe and neighboring countries, based on the national data collection processed run in 2017, led to a file in which more than 10,000 positions have been identified, 40% of which being located in Germany and the UK (in a more or less equal share for each). Several questions arose:

- 1. some positions have been included despite questionable disciplinary characteristics, even though it should be reminded that in case of doubts *inclusion* in the list was to be preferred ;
- 2. there are considerable differences in the labels used nationally to define the various positions (some of them being translated into English with implicit comparisons with Anglo-American academic systems, some of them being kept in their original languages)
- 3. there are considerable and somehow surprising national differences in the amount of positions listed in national lists. This point is discussed in greater length. It appears that the selection criteria indicated to national teams at the beginning of the collection process were and could hardly avoid being general due to the enormous variety of institutional arrangements across national systems. The criteria were applied in the loose manner depending on each national context. Unsurprisingly this led to considerable variations in the answers (populated countries with relatively short lists of PS, less populated countries with relatively long lists of PS). This is explained by the varying attitudes of national experts when confronted to PS with different positions (most senior/most junior scholars).

A discussion started about the merits and problems of having a more or less inclusive list. Supporters of the largest list possible stress the importance of younger scholars (who seem to be the main source of difference between national lists). They stress their decisive contribution to political science publications, especially compared to senior scholars who might be at the top of the academic hierarchy but who do not always exhibit an impressive publication record nor an significant involvement in international cooperation compared to those who are starting their careers – it is suggested that for this reason they could be withdrawn from the list but this would not be consistent with the institutional framework followed in the Action. Supporters of a more restrictive list, while acknowledging junior members' contribution and taking for granted that they belong to the academic PS community, underline that it might give an artificially optimistic view of the strengths of the discipline in terms of institutionalization, which is one main task of WG1.

National lists are shortly presented and explained, with highlights on the most relevant indicators used to identify political scientists.

It is suggested to keep a list with all members with indication of members able to enjoy a lifetime professional career in PS (as civil servants or under private contracts) and those who are not or not yet in such a situation on the basis of guidelines to be discussed in the next Core Group meeting in April 2018.

A short but precise methodological note will be asked from national experts to explain how they built their list of PS positions in their country and how they applied the selection criteria.

This note is to be sent to WG1 chairs by 1 April 2018 at the latest.

Session 2 (afternoon). Institutionalization framework.

WG1 members received the draft of a position paper (authored by G. Capano, G. Ilonszki and C. Roux) devoted to the study of the institutionalization process of PS.

The authors expose the aims and scopes of this paper. It is made to foster the conceptual, theoretical and methodological grounds for the study of the institutionalization process on the basis of the literature about academic disciplines and institutional analysis. They stress that this paper is only a draft in a preliminary version and that it requires obvious improvements through comments and criticisms, starting from the inputs of WG1.

WG1 members still need a bit of time to read carefully the paper but some first comments are already made. Among them the possible linkage of 'disciplines' with neighboring notions (such as epistemic communities or advocacy coalitions) and the relevance of institution-building under an authoritarian rule as it happened in Central / Eastern and Southern Europe are discussed. While further research will be conducted, more extended comments will be welcome.

Day 2.

Session 3 (morning). Discussion of indicators of PS institutionalization.

In connection with the previous discussion of the position paper thoughts are shared to find a list of indicators of institutionalization. Though these indicators do not provide analytical insights *per se* they carry important descriptive information that is needed for the study of the process and for the comparative assessment of PS institutionalization across Europe.

The various elements that arise in the discussion are ordered into categories reflecting the main dimensions of institutionalization discussed in the WG1 Rome meeting in October 2017 (which are used in the paper): organization, teaching and research outputs. A raw table of indicators is being built during the session.

Session 4 (afternoon). Publication strategy

The discussion of the list of indicators goes on in the beginning of the session. WG1 chairs underline the importance of taking advantage of the meeting to create as much discussion as possible. It is agreed that the list eventually built should be ordered and submitted to further comments sent by email.

As for the publication strategy the chair mentioned that a book could be a suitable scientific output that could contribute to the expectations of the Action. The structure of this potential book is discussed. Some suggest that it should contain multi-authored comparative chapters on various aspects of institutionalization. Others contend that this ambitious task might be difficult to carry on given the undefined structure of research questions that arose in the discussion independently from the institutionalization framework, the differences in empirical findings and the most sophisticated arrangements needed for co-authorship. A country-by-country analysis could resolve this but this more classic strategy is criticized because there are previous national analysis already available in the literature. It is observed in reply that these volumes did not necessarily follow an integrated

framework such as the one discussed in the previous session. A further possibility is to combine short national chapters with comparative analysis.

Regarding this comparative endeavor, it is suggested that the comparative analysis could focus on meaningful clusters of countries. It is observed that there are two more or less obvious clusters (Central and Eastern Europe on the one hand, southern Europe on the other) that appear on the basis of contributions provided by WG1. Other members underline that other countries, such as those of Northern Europe, should be included and the question of how to deal with the two 'giants' (UK and Germany) is raised. However the possible only partial coverage could account for the difficulties in the institutionalization process in a large set of countries that actually represent most of the continent.

All these elements will be reported to the Core Group at its meeting scheduled in April 2018.