

# TOWARDS AN EUROPEAN POLITICAL SCIENCE? OPPORTUNITIES AND PITFALLS IN THE INTERNATIONALISATION OF POLITICAL SCIENCE IN EUROPE

## 1. INTRODUCTION<sup>1</sup>

This report investigates the internationalisation of political scientists across Europe through an examination of individual career trajectories and experiences. The data presented in this report demonstrate a number of corroborating patterns that indicate that internationalisation is valued and promoted across European political science. Attending international conferences, publishing in international outlets, and engaging with scholars across Europe through joint publication or research collaboration are three of the core internationalising practices that the European political science community share in common. However, opportunities for internationalisation seem to be siloed according to varying levels of resources. There are differences between scholars based in EU-countries and research-integrated countries (Norway, Switzerland and Iceland) on the one hand and scholars based elsewhere. The latter are less likely to have experienced even minimal levels of internationalisation in recent years. Scholars located outside the EU have fewer opportunities to engage with the international community of political science. They also have fewer opportunities related to international leadership roles.

---

<sup>1</sup> This report is a product of the work of the COST ACTION (CA15207) Professionalization and Social Impact of European Political Science. COST ACTIONS are a Horizon 2020 scheme geared towards developing collaboration and knowledge exchange between scholars across Europe and beyond. As such, the COST scheme is not a primarily research-related scheme and does not provide any funding for conducting research. This report draws from the collaboration between the members of the Working Group 2 “Internationalization of Political Science: Supranational Mobility and Transnational Research” led by Professor Isabelle Engeli and Dr Dobrinka Kostova. The Working Group members who have attended more than one WG meeting are: Ana Miškovska Kajevska (Macedonia), Peter Csanyi (Austria), Damir Kapidžić (Bosnia and Herzegovina), Tero Erkkilä (Finland), Dobrinka Kostova (Bulgaria ; WG2 Vice-Leader), Vladimíra Dvořáková (Czech Republic), Marc Smyrl (France), Thibaud Boncourt (France), Kire Sharlamanov (FYR Macedonia), Filippo Tronconi (Italy), Diana Janušauskien (Lithuania), Miro Haček (Slovenia), Isabelle Engeli (UK), Claudius Wagemann (Germany).

The report primarily relies on the data provided by the PROSEPS survey of political scientists across the entire set of European countries. In order to enhance data comparability across Europe, all the respondents in the survey reporting not holding a PhD have been excluded from the analysis (N=149). Academic systems across Europe vary regarding the integration of PhD researchers and temporary lecturers. Some systems heavily rely on PhD researchers (such as Germany or Switzerland) for delivering teaching activities and conducting research projects. Other systems rely mostly on academic staff who hold a PhD (such as the UK). Some systems have a number of scholars who have made significant contributions to the field without holding a PhD mostly because it did not exist at the time they completed their studies. Other systems rely on part-time lecturer who may have an external occupation and who teach specialized courses on the side. All these differences across systems are of course part of the diversity of European political science.

While the PROSEPS survey achieved a relatively satisfactory response rate for this kind of survey, the response rate by country nevertheless varies quite significantly. Also, political science is still nascent in some systems and remain relatively small. All in all, the N is not big enough in a number of countries to enable robust country-by-country analysis. This report presents findings only at the European level. A final caveat: it is worth noting that surveys trigger all sorts of behaviours. For example, one may tend to spontaneously overrate/underrate activities and performance or one may be more incline to respond to a survey which topic is of personal interest. Given the fact that no resources were provided by COST to conduct research, it was beyond the scope of this Working Group to develop objective indicators of internationalisation. Therefore, the report focuses mostly on the broad trends and, when relevant, the variations and differences in proportion rather than in the absolute percentages.

## 2. THEMES: OPPORTUNITIES AND PITFALLS IN THE INTERNATIONALISATION OF POLITICAL SCIENCE

### 2.1 Overview of current international practices

Internationalisation processes are multilevel and multidimensional. Internationalisation can refer to the practices of individual scholars, to the ambition of the university and to the global penetration of a specific academic system. This report focuses on the individual level – through the PROSEPS survey - and the system level – through the analysis of national support schemes for internationalisation across Europe. Internationalisation is also multidimensional.

A first distinction is to be made between mobility and internationalisation. Mobility involves geographical/physical mobility where a scholar moves from their institutional country to another one, regardless of the time spent in the latter. Internationalisation may involve mobility but is neither restricted to it nor conditioned by it. Internationalisation is a broader phenomenon that involves intellectual exposure to international scholarship and community of scholars. We rely on the assumption that international mobility does not necessarily result in the internationalisation of the academic environment of the scholars while non-international mobility does not necessarily impact negatively on the internationalisation of scholarly research. Internationalisation in this report covers all the activities related to individual exposure to international scholarship (such as reading and citing international publications) and to international research activities (such as participating in an international conference or a workshop, stay abroad, international research collaboration). International mobility covers sabbatical schemes, international fellowships, and teaching exchange schemes. It also includes moving to another institution based in another country for the time of the studies or later in the career.

*Table 1* provides an overview of key internationalising practices at the individual level: international mobility, international research collaboration, international publication, and international service and leadership. We will discuss each of these practices in turn.

*Table 1: Overview of international practices across Europe (in %)*

<b>Activities conducted over the last three years</b>	<b>Never</b>	<b>At least once/one</b>	<b>N</b>
<b>International Mobility<sup>2</sup></b>			

<sup>2</sup> The questions read as follow: “How many times in the past three years have you Gone on a research stay abroad of at least 2 weeks/ Taught outside the country where you work/ Participated

Going on research stay abroad	43	57	1927
Going on a teaching stay abroad	43	58	1927
Participating in international conference	3	97	1963
<b>International Research Collaboration<sup>3</sup></b>			
Publishing with international co-author(s)	30	70	1912
Participating in international research collaboration	17	83	1941
Participating to an international funded project	69	31	1995
Collaborating in an international research network	38	62	1995
<b>International Publication<sup>4</sup></b>			
Publishing an article in an international peer-reviewed journal	10	89	1963
Publishing a chapter with an international publisher	22	78	1952
Publishing a monograph with an international publisher	69	31	1910
<b>International Professional Services<sup>5</sup></b>			
Reviewing a grant application to international/non-national bodies	62	38	1995
Reviewing a manuscript for an international peer-reviewed journal	25	75	1995
Reviewing a book manuscript for an international publisher	71	29	1995
Serving as Editor of an international peer-reviewed journal	83	17	1995
Serving as Editor of a book series for an international publisher	95	5	1995

(presented a paper or acted as discussant) in an international conference?”. The answers “at least once” and “Three or more times” have been grouped together for this report.

<sup>3</sup> The questions read as follow: “How many times in the past three years have you Published with international co-authors/Participated in an international research collaboration?”, and as follow: “Did you participate during the last three years in any of the following activities: Member of an international research network within your field of interest / Partner of Subcontractor of a research project funded by international institutions (H2020, ERC, COST, etc.)?”

The answers “at least once” and “Three or more times” have been grouped together for this report.

<sup>4</sup> The questions read as follow: “Regarding your publishing record, please indicate whether in the last three years you have published: Articles in peer-reviewed international journals / Chapters in edited books published by international publishing house/ Monographs published by international publishing house”. The answers “at least one” and “Three or more” have been grouped together for this report.

<sup>5</sup> The questions read as follow: “Did you participate during the last three years in any of the following activities? Referee for an international peer-reviewed journal / Reviewer of project applications funded by international or other country’s institution / Editor for an international peer-reviewed journal / Reviewer for an international publishing house (in a country different from where you currently reside / Book series editors for an international publishing house (in a country different from where you currently reside)”. Respondent were expected to select Yes if they had performed the activity in the last three years.

On the side of international mobility, participation in conferences is an overwhelmingly shared activity across political science in Europe. Almost all respondents have attended an international conference at least once over the last three years. While teaching/research stays are more taxing in terms of time and resources, they seem to be still highly valued and a majority of respondents have declared that they have been on a research/teaching stay abroad of more than 5 days over the last three years. Turning to internationalisation activities, *Table 1* reveals similar broad patterns. The vast majority of respondents privilege international research collaboration through publishing with an international co-author and participating in international research collaboration and network. Participating in an international funded project is more discriminating and only a minority of our sample have reported having conducted such activities over the last three years. A greater emphasis has been placed over the last two decades on international publications. A large majority of the respondents to the PROSEPS survey has indeed embraced this trend with articles, chapters and monographs published in international outlets. The last dimension differentiates the internationalising set of practices of professional service activities. While a solid majority have acted as reviewer for an international journal, only a minority of respondents have engaged in international scholarly leadership, such as editorship of journals and book series with international profiles.

## **2.2 Attitudes towards internationalisation**

There is much support among PROSEPS respondents for the contention that internationalisation is an important dimension of professional activity in political science, even more pronounced among respondents who do not have (yet) a permanent contract.<sup>6</sup> The motivations for internationalisation are as expected multiple, ranging from contributing to knowledge building and learning from others to career promotion (*Table 2*).

---

<sup>6</sup> Some systems mostly rely on contracts that are limited in time even for staff who are de facto permanent staff.

Table 2: Motivations for conducting international activities (in %)

<b>What are your principal motivations for international activities?<sup>7</sup></b>	<b>Not Important</b>	<b>Important</b>	<b>N</b>
<b>Contributing to knowledge building</b>	26	74	1995
<b>Learning from others</b>	21	79	1995
<b>Promoting my academic career</b>	46	54	1995

While internationalisation is highly considered, nurturing ties in the national context is also important more often than not. Striking the right balance between national and international activities is a complex question. *Table 3* reveals that opinions are rather split on the matter. Respondents were asked to rate the importance the national level vs. the international level of a number of key academic activities (publication, research funding, networking and research collaboration) on a scale from 0 (national) to 10 (international). A majority of respondents consider that it is important to find a balance between the national and international levels for research funding, networking and collaboration. However, for publication, there is a small majority leaning towards giving prominence to the international level.

Table 3: Striking the right balance between national and international activities (in %)

<b>At which level is it more important to ...?<sup>8</sup></b>	<b>National</b>	<b>Both levels</b>	<b>International</b>	<b>N</b>
Publish	4	34	62	1932
Secure research funding	14	57	29	1886
Network	8	57	35	1927
Collaborate on research projects	7	51	42	1925

<sup>7</sup> The question reads as follow: “What are your principal motivations for international activities?”. Three motivations were offered: “Contributing to knowledge building”, “Learning from others”, “Promoting my academic career”. Respondents were asked to select any of the motivations that apply.

<sup>8</sup> The questions read as follow: “At which level (national versus international) is it more important to develop the following aspects of your career?: Creating networks / Publishing / Collaborating on research projects / Securing research funding”. Respondents were asked to position themselves on a scale ranging from 0 (only the national level is important) to 10 (only the international level is important) with 5 labelled as “Both equally important”. Answers from 0 to 4 have been regrouped as “national”, answers from 6 to 10 have been regrouped as “international”.

The relevance of internationalisation to a scholarly career is highly contextualised. Securing international publications seem to be more important for scholars who do not enjoy a permanent contract and for scholars based in the EU, Iceland, Switzerland and Norway while international networks are slightly more important for scholars who have a permanent position. Probably due to the scarcity of national opportunities, securing research funding at the international level is more important for scholars based outside the EU, Iceland, Switzerland and Norway.

Overall, a number of profiles of international political scientists emerge from the analysis. Internationalization is more than the sum of its parts (mobility, international exchange/inputs, international outputs). International mobility does not necessarily result in the internationalization of the academic universe of the scholars while the absence of international mobility does not necessarily impact negatively on the internationalization of the academic universe.

### **2.3 Inequalities in internationalization**

Sections 1 and 2 have described overall patterns in internationalisation practices across Europe. While these analyses have revealed a number of similarities across the respondents to the PROSEPS survey, they also pointed out a number of differences. Section 3 investigates more closely these differences and inequalities towards internationalisation according to gender, the type of contract (permanent vs. non-permanent) and institutional location. We discuss each of these in turn. *Table 4* reveals that among PROSEP respondents, female and male scholars largely adopt the same behaviour towards internationalisation. With the exception of publishing monographs, a similar proportion of women and men report having engaged in the key activities related to internationalisation. Female respondents report attending international conferences, publishing in international journals and engaging in international collaboration at similar rates to male respondents.

Turning to the variation in internationalising practices between respondents who hold a permanent contract and ones who are on a non-permanent position, larger contrasts in a number of aspects. While non-permanent faculty are as eager as permanent faculty to publish in international journals and to engage on international funded projects, they seem to be slightly less involved in collaborating with international co-authors and in research networks and have fewer opportunities for reviewing grant applications and book manuscripts. We note that this may be also due to the earlier stage of the career of non-permanent respondents.

Table 4: Similarities and differences in international practices between women and men (in %)

Activities conducted at least once over the last three years	Female	Male	N
<b>International Mobility</b>			
Going on research stay abroad	58	56	640/ 1232
Going on a teaching stay abroad	56	58	639/ 1233
Participating in international conference	98	96	655/ 1251
<b>International Research Collaboration</b>			
Publishing with international co-author(s)	79	69	646/ 1210
Participating in international research collaboration	85	83	676/ 1307
Participating to an international funded project	34	30	666/ 1270
Collaborating in an international research network	67	59	666/ 1270
<b>International Publication</b>			
Publishing an article in an international peer-reviewed journal	90	90	657/ 1251
Publishing a chapter with an international publisher	75	79	651/ 1245
Publishing a monograph with an international publisher	26	33	637/ 1219
<b>International Professional Services</b>			
Reviewing a grant application to international/non-national bodies	36	39	666/ 1270
Reviewing a manuscript for an international peer-reviewed journal	73	76	666/ 1270
Reviewing a book manuscript for an international publisher	25	31	666/ 1270
Serving in an editorial role on an international peer-reviewed journal	17	16	666/ 1270
Serving in an editorial role on a book series of an international publisher	5	5	666/ 1270



Table 5: Similarities and differences in international practices according to employment contract (in %)

Activities conducted at least once over the last three years	Non-Permanent	Permanent	N
<b>International Mobility</b>			
Going on research stay abroad	58	57	524/ 1333
Going on a teaching stay abroad	48	61	424/ 1333
Participating in international conference	97	97	528/ 1364
<b>International Research Collaboration</b>			
Publishing with international co-author(s)	66	72	516/ 1331
Participating in international research collaboration	80	85	524/ 1349
Participating to an international funded project	29	32	536/ 1384
Collaborating in an international research network	58	64	536/ 1384
<b>International Publication</b>			
Publishing an article in an international peer-reviewed journal	89	90	527/ 1366
Publishing a chapter with an international publisher	70	81	525/ 1358
Publishing a monograph with an international publisher	27	32	515/ 1331
<b>International Professional Services</b>			
Reviewing a grant application to international/non-national bodies	19	45	536/ 1384
Reviewing a manuscript for an international peer-reviewed journal	71	78	536/ 1384
Reviewing a book manuscript for an international publisher	18	34	536/ 1384
Serving as Editor of an international peer-reviewed journal	11	19	536/ 1384
Serving as Editor of a book series for an international publisher	4	6	536/ 1384

*Table 6* reveals striking differences between scholars according to their institutional location and their integration into EU-related research collaboration. We have divided the PROSEPS respondents into three categories. The first category includes the EU member states who joined the EU before 2004 as well as Iceland, Switzerland, and Norway that have developed sustained collaboration with EU member states over research since an early stage. The second category regroups the member states who have joined the EU in 2004 or after. The third category merges all the European countries included in the PROSEPS survey that are not part of the EU and have not developed sustained research integration with EU member states.

Attending international conferences and doing a research abroad are the only internationalising activities that display similar proportions across the three groups of scholars. All the other dimensions show differences both between EU countries and non-EU countries, and to a lesser extent within EU countries. Scholars based outside the EU, Iceland, Switzerland and Norway are less likely to have engaged at least once over the last three years with internationalising activities. These scholars are less likely to have opportunities to publish with international co-authors, to participate in international funded projects and to be integrated in international collaborations and networks. They are also provided with fewer occasions to perform professional services. They are less frequently invited to review grant applications, article manuscripts and book manuscripts and they are less likely to serve as journal and book series editors. In a nutshell, scholars based outside the EU have less support for engaging with international political science which may in turn explain their relative marginalised status in the discipline.

*Table 6* also shows some variations between scholars in countries who joined the EU in 2004 and after and the countries who joined the EU prior to 2004 or have been integrated research-wise (Iceland, Norway, Switzerland). With the exception of international funded projects, the former are slightly less likely to engage in any kind of international research collaboration and international publication. They are also less likely to engage in leadership roles at the international level, at least within the associations that were originally developed in Western Europe.

Table 6: Similarities and differences in international practices across Europe (in %)

Activities conducted at least once over the last three years	NON-EU	EU +ISL/CH/NOR	EU 2004 and after	N
<b>International Mobility</b>				
Going on research stay abroad	56	58	53	227/1354/346
Going on a teaching stay abroad	48	57	64	225/1354/348
Participating in international conference	97	97	96	238/1369/356
<b>International Research Collaboration</b>				
Publishing with international co-author(s)	51	76	59	221/1347/344
Participating in international research collaboration	70	86	81	227/1362/352
Participating to an international funded project	18	31	37	249/1385/361
Collaborating in an international research network	49	67	57	249/1385/361
<b>International Publication</b>				
Publishing an article in an international peer-reviewed journal	87	92	85	239/1367/357
Publishing a chapter with an international publisher	68	82	69	237/1359/356
Publishing a monograph with an international publisher	30	33	21	224/1335/351
<b>International Professional Services</b>				
Reviewing a grant application to international/non-national bodies	20	44	25	249/1395/361
Reviewing a manuscript for an international peer-reviewed journal	55	85	52	249/1395/361
Reviewing a book manuscript for an international publisher	15	36	13	249/1395/361
Serving as Editor of an international peer-reviewed journal	10	18	15	249/1395/361
Serving as Editor of a book series for an international publisher	4	7	3	249/1395/361

## 2.4 Overview of current support towards internationalization

A majority of PROSEPS respondents have received some sort of support for their international activities in the last three years. The most common support is funding for conference attendance followed by teaching or research fellowships (*Table 7*). *Table 8* reveals one more time interesting variation between non-EU countries and EU countries (plus Iceland, Switzerland Norway). While the proportion of research or teaching fellowships is largely similar across the three groups of respondents, respondents based in non-EU countries report having received less support for conference, grant application and language issues.

Table 7: Support received for international activities (in %)

How have your international activities been supported ...? <sup>9</sup>	Support received	N
Research or teaching fellowship	46	1995
Funding for conference participation	76	1995
Financial/Administrative/Technical support	30	1995
Language support	22	1995

Table 8: Variation in support received for international activities across Europe (in %)

How have your international activities been supported ...?	NON-EU	EU +ISL/ CH/NOR	EU 2004 and after	N
Research or teaching fellowship	41	45	50	249/1385/361
Funding for conference participation	55	79	74	249/1385/361
Financial/Administrative/Technical support	16	33	32	249/1385/361
Language support	7	24	23	249/1385/361

Participants in the PROSEPS COST Action were asked to provide a country report that included a question about schemes to support internationalisation available at the national and/or regional level. A more advanced data collection in a sample of countries (indicated in bold in Table 8) was also conducted within the Working Group through two specific STSMS lead by Ana Miškovska Kajevska.<sup>10</sup> Table 9 provides an overview of the funding schemes available across Europe at the national and/or regional level to support the internationalisation of political science during the 2018-2019 academic year.

While the existence of national schemes supporting internationalisation does not necessarily tell much about the amount of funding available and the competitiveness of the schemes, it still provides an indication about the support for internationalisation that is intended at the

---

<sup>9</sup> The questions read as follow: “In the past three years, how have your international activities have been supported? Research or teaching fellowship / Funding for travel to conferences / Financial, administrative, or technical support for applying for funded projects / Language editing support”. Respondents could choose between “Yes” and “No”.

<sup>10</sup> Our warmest gratitude goes to Ana Miškovska Kajevska for the data collection and her significant contribution in improving the coding scheme and to Damir Kapidžić for having hosted the two STSMS.

governmental level across Europe. The picture that emerges from Table 8 is, at the very least, contrasted. We defined seven types of support. Bilateral and targeted cooperation includes all the specific research and teaching cooperation schemes aiming at facilitating collaboration between a limited number of countries. The Visegrád initiative is a good illustration of this type of internationalisation incentive. The Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland and Slovakia have forged an alliance for cooperation that has a research component aiming at facilitating collaboration between scholars based in the four countries. The second and third types of support are related to supporting the internationalisation of PhD and Postdoc researchers through funding for international research stays, conference participation and training. The fourth type provides funding for the organisation of an international event (such as a workshop or a conference) in the same country while the fifth type encourages research collaboration with an international component. The sixth type of internationalising support emphasises the enhancement of international leadership profiles through either the funding of stays abroad or the visit of international scholars to the funding country. Finally, the last type of support for internationalisation is a relatively new one: specific funding support for the preparation of applications to international grants (such as Horizon 2020 research grants or ERC grants).

Among these seven types of support for internationalisation, three of them stand out: bilateral/targeted cooperation (20 countries), support for postdoc researchers (17 countries) and schemes related international leadership (19 countries). Ten countries included in Table 8 have specific support for the internationalisation of PhD researchers. Only a minority of countries have specific funding for fostering international research collaboration via support for research networks with a research component (6 countries), funding for hosting international events (5 countries) and support for international grant applications (6 countries). Overall, it seems that most domestic funding schemes are still mostly supporting the internationalising practices of scholars on an individual basis rather than the internationalisation of research collaboration per se.

All in all, it seems that the distribution of internationalisation schemes displays a similar picture emerges as for internationalising practises at the individual level. EU member states, Iceland, Switzerland and Norway have been offering far more support for internationalisation at the domestic level than other countries. In the non-EU member states in the Balkans and Eastern Europe, the largest funding for international activities comes from international funders such as Fulbright-related support.

Table 9: National and regional schemes supporting internationalisation across Europe

Country	Targeted cooperation	Postdoc support	PhD support	Academic event	Research collaboration	Research Leadership	Grant application
Albania							
<b>Austria</b>	<b>X</b>	<b>X</b>	<b>X</b>			<b>X</b>	<b>X</b>
<b>Belgium</b>		<b>X</b>	<b>X</b>	<b>X</b>		<b>X</b>	<b>X</b>
Bosnia and Herzegovina							
<b>Croatia</b>	<b>X</b>	<b>X</b>			<b>X</b>	<b>X</b>	<b>X</b>
<b>Czech Republic</b>	<b>X</b>						
<b>DK</b>	<b>X</b>	<b>X</b>		<b>X</b>		<b>X</b>	
Estonia	X					X	
<b>France</b>	<b>X</b>				<b>X</b>	<b>X</b>	
<b>Germany</b>	<b>X</b>	<b>X</b>					
<b>Hungary</b>	<b>X</b>	<b>X</b>	<b>X</b>				<b>X</b>
Iceland						X	
<b>Ireland</b>	<b>X</b>	<b>X</b>				<b>X</b>	
Israel	X	X			X		
Italy							
<b>Lithuania</b>	<b>X</b>	<b>X</b>	<b>X</b>				
Lithuania	X	X	X			X	
Luxembourg						X	X
Moldova	X						
<b>Norway</b>	<b>X</b>	<b>X</b>	<b>X</b>	<b>X</b>	<b>X</b>	<b>X</b>	
<b>Poland</b>	<b>X</b>	<b>X</b>	<b>X</b>		<b>X</b>	<b>X</b>	<b>X</b>
Portugal	X	X	X				
<b>Slovakia</b>	<b>X</b>						
Slovenia						X	
<b>Spain</b>						<b>X</b>	

Sweden	X				X	X	
<b>Switzerland</b>		<b>X</b>	<b>X</b>	<b>X</b>		<b>X</b>	
<b>The Netherlands</b>	<b>X</b>	<b>X</b>				<b>X</b>	
<b>The UK</b>	<b>X</b>	<b>X</b>	<b>X</b>			<b>X</b>	
Turkey		X		X		X	

NB: in bold: country sample for which extra data collection has been conducted. The classification of all the other countries relies on the information provided by the MC members of the PROSEPS COST Action in their country report. No information was provided in the country report for the following countries: Bulgaria, Finland, Greece, Latvia, Macedonia, Malta, Montenegro, Romania, Russia and Serbia. These countries have been thus excluded from Table 9.

### 3. CONCLUSION

The internationalisation of political science is well underway. Even if survey results always need to be taken with a grain of salt, there is a coherent message emerging from the COST survey: internationalisation is valued and promoted by the vast majority of the respondents across Europe. Attending international conferences, publishing in international outlets, and engaging with scholars across Europe via joint publication or research collaboration are three of the fundamental internationalising practices that the European political science community share in common. Experiences reported in the COST survey also corroborate practices on the ground. A large majority of respondents see added value in engaging with the political science community at the international level regarding the contribution to scholarly efforts toward knowledge building and knowledge transfer. This engagement with internationalisation does not seem to be to the detriment of the national disciplinary community. PROSEPS respondents report strong interest in maintaining engagement with their national community via networking and research collaboration.

While the survey reveals broad support for international scholarly exchange, it also sheds light on severe inequalities in internationalising capability. Opportunities for internationalisation seem to be siloed according to varying level of resources. The most striking inequality lies in the location of the respondent's institution. Attending international conferences is the only internationalising activity that displays a similar level across Europe. For all the other main dimensions of internationalisation, there are differences between scholars based in EU-countries and in Norway, Switzerland and Iceland on the one hand and scholars based in non-EU countries on the other. The latter are less likely to have experienced even relatively minimal level of internationalisation in the recent years: they are less likely to publish at the international level, to participate in research collaboration and to provide services such as reviewing grant applications and journal manuscripts. Scholars located outside the EU or in countries who have joined the EU in 2004 or after have, overall, less support for engaging with the international community of political science. They also have fewer opportunities related to international leadership roles. This points out to the integrative role of (European) collaborative research funding for example.

This differentiation in opportunities for internationalisation has consequences for knowledge building and the creation of a European-wide political science. In a recent study on countries studied



in comparative public policy, Engeli and Rothmayr (2018)<sup>11</sup> found that that a large proportion of Central and Eastern Europe remained under-investigated. The scholarly community tends to cumulate knowledge on a limited number of countries (such as the UK, Germany, the USA just to name three) and to neglect the study of the others. It is plausible to assume that the limitation in research coverage cascades into limitations in teaching coverage which is in result detrimental to the training received by students. Attendance at the general conferences of the major European political science association, The European Consortium for Political Research (ECPR), also reveals a concentration of scholars based in Northern and Western Europe. While improvements have been made over the years, speakers at plenary events are still less likely to be based in Central and Eastern Europe. The institutions who are members of the ECPR are also largely based in the same region. Progress has been made but it is likely that we still fall short of an integrated community of political scientists at the European level. All in all, the issue is not only to encourage the internationalisation of political science in Europe but also to enable a sustainable and inclusive internationalisation towards shaping a real European political science.

How to improve this situation of unequal access to internationalisation? On the basis of the COST PROSEPS survey results and the discussion that took place within Working Group 2, we can formulate three recommendations.

**1. Intensify the supports for scholarly exchange and research collaboration across Europe.** The COST Action scheme is an interesting example for enabling such collaboration with specific targets and support. It remains one of the only schemes at the European level that promotes such exchange. The survey results demonstrate that the principle barrier to internationalisation across Europe remains primarily lack of resources in some countries, and systematic pan-European support schemes would go a long way towards reducing them.

**2. Intensify targeted support for conference participation and research collaboration** for scholars based in universities with limited support for internationalising activities such a conference scholarship but also locating major international conferences more often in Central and Eastern Europe. While general access support schemes (such as the COST Action scheme) are vital for creating pan-European networks of scholars, targeted schemes aimed at universities and countries with lower levels of resources serve to level the playing field and may be the determinant factor in

---

<sup>11</sup> Engeli, I. and C. Rothmayr (2018). « Beyond the Usual Suspects: New Research Themes in Comparative Public Policy », *Journal of Comparative Policy Analysis*, 20(1) : 114-32.

whether a scholar from one of these locations is able to engage in highly prized international activities such as conference participation and research collaboration.

**3. Promote the visibility of scholars from underrepresented regions in international academic events and activities.** While efforts have been made over the recent years to promote inclusivity, participation on plenary events in major international conferences in Europe and in international leadership (such as journal editor-in-chief) still falls short of displaying a satisfactory integration of scholarly work produced in Central and Eastern Europe. The promotion of scholars from these regions serves to remind the wider political science community of the valuable research that is being done in these locations and also serves as an incentive to scholars in those regions to continue to pursue their activities, even when indigenous resources and rewards may be scarce.