

The address of the new SISP president: a new élan for Italian Political Science

By Pietro Grilli di Cortona, 15/11/2013

Rome, November 26, 2013

DEAR COLLEAGUES, in my new role as President of the Italian Political Science Association (SISP), I am very happy to have the opportunity to express my best wishes towards all those doing research and teaching Political Science in Italian universities. I am grateful to IPS for giving me this opportunity.

Political Science is a growing discipline, and is being taught in an increasing number of Italian departments and faculties. More members have joined our association (we are nearly 400 members strong), and more books and articles are being published. After such significant progress, we should all consider making an assessment of our current state in order to create a strategy for our future. Presently, at least two problematic aspects should be acknowledged. First, our discipline does not have enough influence on policy makers. A clear example is the presence of just one political scientist among the members of the ministerial committee focused on the reform of the Italian Constitution. Second, with regard to our scientific performance, I want to remind you that, on the whole, political scientists have achieved modest results both in the process of evaluation of the products of scientific research 2004-2010 (VQR), and in the final allocation of funding as part of national interest research projects (PRIN 2010-11). For these reasons, in the coming years, we need to work hard to boost our image and to develop the future of our discipline. Moreover, we should take a more active role in the decisions that affect and condition our university courses and scientific research evaluation.

Finally, I welcome new relevant engagements with the association. The renovation of our journal (*Rivista Italiana di Scienza Politica*), initiated by Luca Verzichelli, is an interesting challenge for the new editors and the entire association. This will require great effort and determination. The colleagues of the SISP Executive Committee and I will be enthusiastically engaged in all of these important tasks for the development of our professional and scholarly agenda.

Pietro Grilli di Cortona, *Roma Tre University*

Welcome to Amie Kreppel and Fabio Franchino, the new editors of the Italian Political Science Review

By Nicolò Conti, 15/11/2013

Amie Kreppel is professor of Political Science at the University of Florida, where she also serves as the Director of the Jean Monnet Centre of Excellence. She is the Chair of the European Union Studies Association (EUSA). She was awarded her PhD from the University of California, Los Angeles. Her work has appeared in a wide variety of journals including *Comparative Political Studies*, *European Union Politics*, *European Journal of Political Research*, *Journal of European Public Policy*, *Journal of Common Market Studies*, *British Journal of Political Research*, *Political Research Quarterly*. She is the author of *European Parliament and the Supranational Party System: A Study of Institutional Development* (Cambridge University Press, 2002).

Fabio Franchino is professor of Political Science at the University of Milan. In the past, he held positions at the London School of Economics and the University College London. He received a PhD from the London School of Economics. He has published articles in journals such as the *American Political Science Review*, *European Union Politics*, *European Journal of Political Research*, *West European Politics*, *Journal of European Public Policy*, *British Journal of Political Science*. He is the author of *The Powers of the Union: Delegation in the EU* (Cambridge University Press, 2007).

As from 2014, they will be general editors of the *Italian Political Science Review*. We interviewed them on the subject of academic internationalization.

IPS: How would you define internationalization in our field?

Amie Kreppel: Internationalization can mean many things, incorporating both the subject and the actor – in this case the topics of research and the character of the researcher. My understanding of the term includes both as well. This means research projects that, even when focused on a particular case, integrate an awareness of the broader context and (international) comparative cases. For academics it means the development of research networks that ignore national boundaries. Increasingly research groups are international and research projects integrate methods, questions and evidence from multiple sources. The availability of so many national journals, conference paper databases and working paper archives online has opened many new research doors, making this type of research more achievable than ever.

Fabio Franchino: I would say the degree to which one's work is influenced by and influences the work of colleagues in the international academic community. This community may well comprise colleagues whose office is next to mine, so it is more a frame of mind than a matter of geography. If, when beginning a research project, one draws from theories and insights that travel across national communities and geographic boundaries and, when disseminating research results, one tries to communicate to the international academic community – that would be internationalization.

IPS: How has internationalization impacted your career?

AK: As a comparativist my work is inherently international in character, however my own career trajectory began as a project in internationalization. Having studied as an undergraduate

in Italy (Universita` di Firenze) my perspective has, from the beginning, been influenced by scholars and research topics (that at the time) I would not have had access to had I stayed in the USA. These early experiences shaped my thinking long before I ever considered a dissertation topic and have remained very much a part of my approach to research and teaching. Since that early experience I have been fortunate to have the opportunity to teach and conduct research in several countries and to build collaborative relationships with scholars from across the globe.

FF: Quite a bit, initially through student mobility, between Italy and the UK; I was then lucky enough to carry out my doctoral training and my first steps in the profession in an academically competitive environment. You end up by default benchmarking against leading scholars in the profession. It can be daunting at the beginning, but it is very stimulating.

IPS: From your perspective, how internationalized is the Italian Academia? And what are the improvements to be made?

AK: I cannot speak for all of Italian academia being familiar primarily with political science and to a lesser degree law. But, in these two fields, and political science in particular I think Italian scholars are among the more internationalized in Europe, particularly among the non-native English speakers – which naturally creates a barrier to internationalization given that so much is conducted in English. Even in the 1980s when I first studied in Italy, many (if not most) of the books and articles I was assigned were non-Italian in origin and the topics (again in comparative politics) were inherently international in character. Italy has a large number of English language, or mixed English-Italian graduate programs that facilitate the internationalization of young scholars. Methodologically I see more Italian political scientists being open to a wide array of different approaches and a comparatively high level of collaboration. That said, as might be expected there is a generational divide and these trends are more prevalent among younger scholars. But remember perhaps the best known modern Italian political scientist, Giovanni Sartori, is himself emblematic of internationalization in both his work and his career. I think this example has been important.

That said, there are certainly improvements that could be made. A greater emphasis on getting the great work done by Italian scholars to be more generally accessible is part of it – through English language publications that are readily available on line so that people who are not specialists and who are outside of Italy can have access to them. Increasing transnational collaboration and, perhaps most difficult – increasing efforts to study Italy as a comparative case. In many ways (and for some very good reasons) Italians who study Italy often treat it as “exceptional” in the same way American scholars of US politics often eschew comparison because of the exceptional character of the US system. This limits not only our understanding of Italy, but also the reach of the work. Placing Italian studies within a broader comparative context would expand the circle of scholars working on Italy as a case and would significantly expand the internationalization of the discipline within Italy.

FF: These are important questions that are hard to answer – not because I want to shy away from them, but because they should be properly answered with data at hand (the VQR exercise could come handy). In my rather impressionistic opinion – taking other European countries as benchmark -, we are probably lagging behind our north European neighbours, but we are doing fine compared to other south European countries.

However, internazionalization should not be an end in itself, but, as I said, a tool or a frame of mind to produce excellent research. Excellence in research is our top priority as scholars. The two concepts do not necessarily go hand in hand. One in theory could attend the best international conferences in the profession, be quite internationalized, but fail to publish in top journals or with top publishers. And there may be colleagues that attend fewer conferences but manage to produce excellent research.

In practice however, we know that internationalization and research excellence are strongly correlated, for obvious reasons. One wants to draw from the best theories on offer out there, without boundaries, wants his or her research to be challenged by the most prestigious colleagues, wherever they are, and likes his or her research to be acknowledged as having improved our understanding of important political phenomena, and, ideally, even to have an impact on policy makers. It is unlikely that we can accomplish these objectives ignoring what goes on beyond national boundaries; scholars in top universities certainly do not do this. For a mid-sized academic community of political scientists in a mid-size country like Italy, the continuous interaction with the international community is the key to producing excellent research.

IPS: What would be your suggestions to a new generation of scholars who want to incorporate an international dimension into their career?

AK: As indicated above – it would involve a two-prong approach. Internationalizing both content and character. This means on the one hand, incorporating research topics and methods from different schools of political science, and in comparative politics and Italian studies working to expand the cases examined. On the other hand Italian scholars need to actively develop their international networks – build relationships and develop research projects with scholars from outside Italy.

FF: Young scholars (as well as anyone else, I would say) should concentrate on producing excellent research – and the production of excellent research is deeply ingrained in an attitude that merge intellectual curiosity and scientific rigour with hard work, adaptability and continuous learning (caring about your object of study also helps). What I like the most in young scholars is when they challenge established works – not for the sake of being gratuitously confrontational -, but because they say: ‘This is what I have discovered, and this supports only partially – or does not support – the established theory, for the following reasons’. Rigorous falsification is what I truly like.

Scientific innovation can take several forms – this is the first thing that I say to my doctoral students. Once you get acquainted with the best literature on the phenomenon that you are interested in understanding, you can innovate with data, theory, method and measurement or any combination of the above. Opportunities abound. The international dimension is instrumental to excellence in research because it is where the frontier of research lies, it is where you can find new data, refine theories, learn new methods and develop better ways at measuring your objects of interest.

There are of course several broader ‘life experience’ benefits associated with spending a period of research and work abroad (as well as some costs); but if one wants an international experience to foster his or her own career, I think she should use it to acquire knowledge and learn important skills.

IPS: As from 2014, you will be general editors of the Italian Political Science Review. What are your plans to make this journal more international?

AK: My presence as co-editor is a good start. I believe I will be the first non-Italian to serve in any governing capacity with the journal. Fabio Franchino and I have worked hard to expand the international editorial board and we will work with them to attract high quality manuscripts from a broad range of scholars from Italy and elsewhere. Fabio and I will also be working to encourage scholars (young and more established) to consider the IPSR as a valuable outlet for their research by attending conferences and looking for research we think would be suitable. We have also worked to increase our reviewer pool and to ensure that reviewers represent multiple countries and methodological approaches wherever possible to improve the quality of reviewer feedback and integrate an international component into this stage of the process as well. Our goal is a lofty one, we would like to see IPSR join the ranks of the British Journal of Political Science and the American Political Science Review as a truly great national journal. This will require time, and a good deal of effort. The move to English language will help increase the readership of the journal beyond the national confines. Working to make it easily accessible online will also be critically important. Then we need to focus on getting really top-notch work in the journal to increase citations and with them – awareness. This will create a virtuous circle that naturally serves to internationalize the journal.

FF: From ebooks to journal articles, almost the entire scientific knowledge produced in our discipline in, say, the past ten years is at a click-of-a-mouse away. For any scholar, this is nothing less than wonderland. If one wants to update his knowledge, acquire new skills or disseminate research results, the barriers have dropped significantly. The market of scientific journals in our discipline is global – we cannot ignore this.

Under the editorship of Luca Verzichelli, the Review has moved fully to the English language and I sincerely welcome this change, both because it allows disseminating worldwide our research and makes the Review a more attractive outlet for publication for our colleagues both at home and abroad. The truth of the matter is that, if a young scholar applies to a position abroad,

a publication in Italian adds less value to her resume than one in English – for the simple reason that it can be read by the hiring committee. I want the Review to be an important outlet for dissemination of good research as well as a springboard for the career of young talented scholars.

Therefore, the challenge for the Review is now to acquire more recognition in the international market of political science journals. There are plans and options on the table that we are considering, together with the executive board of the Italian Political Science Association, but which we are not in a position to discuss openly as yet, but the key objective is significantly enhancing diffusion while preserving quality for the entire editorial process, from submission to review and publication.

Teaching innovation at Master level: the ReSHAPE programme on security and emergency policies at the University of Catania

By Fulvio Attinà, 15/11/2013

Innovation can play a role in improving Political Science opportunities to meet the challenge of the uninterrupted movement the Italian universities and European higher education space are going through. Generally speaking, innovation is making changes to something established by introducing something new. In the university, it is the process of radically or incrementally changing products like education, processes like learning, and services like teaching. The following is the short report of the innovation experience of the first year of the three-year **ReSHAPE** programme¹ at the Department of Political and Social Sciences of the University of Catania.

ReSHAPE has been created thanks to the Jean Monnet Chair ad Personam fund offered by the EU Lifelong Learning Programme and addressed to update the curriculum subject, teaching methods and learning practice of the Master (*Laurea Magistrale*) of Global Politics and Euro-Mediterranean Relations, known as **GLOPEM**.² As far as the subject matters are concerned, **ReSHAPE** wants to familiarize students to the European policies towards security and emergencies focusing on the unremitting blurring of the domestic and international setting of such policies. As far as teaching methods are concerned, front lectures are banned in **GLOPEM** courses. The instructor-student interaction is at the core of the class hours. External experts play a role in chief teaching events like the crash course on the action and role of NGOs in emergencies, and the simulation exercise on negotiations at the EU institutions. Last and consequently, learning practice is shaped by blending book and article reading (frequently in electronic format), classroom debates, paper and report writings and discussion, and simulation exercises. *Stages* and intensive programmes like summer schools, including those abroad, are also within the learning and training practice of the Master students. In the following sections, the Programme's features relating to innovation in subject, teaching and learning are shortly illustrated.

Emergencies as new policy object and topic of Political Science

Innovation in teaching is response to change in society and its salient problems. As such, teaching innovation faces the challenge of working with few data and uncertain schemes about the nature of the objects to teach about. Information about social and political objects which are new, in-progress and mutable is small and not easily at hand. Explanatory knowledge is to build from scratch.

Understanding is mostly tentative and hypothetical. Today, security is one of these objects. Usually, security is defined as the condition of the social actor (person, group, organization) whose values (material and immaterial objects of vital importance) are safe against any aggression and threat of aggression by other actors. But, nowadays, security is also the condition of the actor safe against the harms and risk of harms triggered off by events like system crises, big disasters, and accidents to vital infrastructures. Scientists distinguish the latter security condition (they commonly call it *risk security*) from the former (*threat security*) and warn about risks as overtaking on threats as the most serious menace to the values of the individuals and the stability and wealth of the contemporary society.

For sure, there is great need to add knowledge about risks to the existing knowledge about threats. Especially, applied knowledge is tremendously needed by the policy-makers to respond to security

problems in contemporary states and the global system. The disruption of transportation networks caused by a volcano eruption like the Iceland's volcano in 2010, the costs of severe weather conditions brought by climate change, and the harms to social and individual lives caused by technological accidents are true examples of risk insecurity. Irregular migration caused by wars, genocides and mass atrocities and the effect of terrorist attacks are further cases of problems in which insecurity is caused by both risk and threat factors which join one another and spread effect from the area of the event to nearby and distant areas as well. Further on, scientists believe that knowledge-building about risk and threat security is a brand new, multidisciplinary field of research cutting across existing hard and soft science boundaries, including the edge between the domestic and international domain of political science. Additionally, as far as such new fields of study bring better knowledge about the new phenomena and problems, it has to provide also new applied knowledge and respond to the need of the policy-makers and practitioners to prepare for and respond to natural and man-made disasters by setting out appropriate programmes and emergency policies.

Last, teaching Political Science today requests conveying to education such information and knowledge about emergency policies. A few words about the term 'emergency policies' is in order here because there is no consensus in the community of experts. The phenomenon is new. No surprise, then, each expert prefers to use the label that refers the most to the features and aspects he/she is most interested in. Studying policy-making and the policies made to respond to such risk and threat security phenomena, the label 'disaster policies' and 'crisis management policies' are frequently used by the scientists who want to stress the existing difference between the policies towards natural disasters and the policies aimed at responding to risks and threats triggered by human groups. Uncertainty about change is not to be dismissed but it is clear as well that the two areas of problems have much in common as far as the making of policies to respond to current risks and threats comes into play. With few exceptions, emergency policies towards natural disasters and towards human-made disasters share the same features and goals like providing rescue and relief to the victims, inflating resilience to the locals, rebuilding order in the state, reactivating political institutions, and bringing reconstruction and development to the affected communities.

Teaching and learning about emergencies: new resources and practice

University Master courses are not training courses and do not have to give to the students job-specific abilities. Hence, learning at the master level is not learning by doing. Yet, master courses must care about the employability of the graduates. They are *for* providing students with knowledge and abilities useful to make them the successful applicants to a distinct set of jobs. On such assumption, at **GLOPEM**, knowledge and abilities are provided for jobs involving two tasks: (a) the analysis of community/organization problems, and (b) the design and running of corporate strategies towards those problems. **ReSHAPE** provides curricular activities to **GLOPEM** students leading to mastering the abilities for these job tasks. The activities completed in the first year of the programme are briefly described in what follows.

In the "Training course for NGO members", the students learn about the NGOs' methodologies for planning and carrying out cooperation programmes in developing countries. Teaching is given by the staff of CO.P.E. (*Cooperazione Paesi Emergenti*), a NGO active in development cooperation in Africa. Course hour learning is supplemented by groundwork materials and webographies.

In the four-day seminar and simulation on "EU Negotiation", a research and training staff from the Institute for Research and Education on Negotiation (IRENÉ), a section of the Paris business school ESSEC, instructs students to methods and practice of international negotiations. Upon completion of this activity, students get abilities (a) to understand the negotiators' behaviour and the central concepts of negotiation as they apply to the European Union institutional context, and (b) to analyze

negotiation situation and develop negotiation skills, strategies, and approaches to work in the European institutional context.

The “European and Global Politics Twin Seminars” are organized within the existing Double Degree Program of **GLOPEM** and the partner Master Course of the University of Liège. In Seminar One, the students of both courses receive information about the EU action in global politics. Student teams are formed and tasked to write issue reports to discuss at Seminar Two. Such joint **ReSHAPE**-Double Degree Program activity gives to the students a space for developing instant analysis, reporting and discussion abilities.

Lastly, students are involved in the **ReSHAPE** annual workshop, a meeting of experts of emergency policies. This activity gives to students the opportunity to learn about the building of scientific knowledge on emergencies and about the issues at stake in the making of policies at the national and European Union level. The June 2013 Workshop gathered over 25 junior and senior scholars of 13 universities from 9 European countries. The Workshop papers are now on the table of contents of two scientific, peer-reviewed journals.

Lessons learned

All activities have been evaluated by the students. Some activities were open to Non-**GLOPEM** students. Users’ response and satisfaction prove that the programme is a good instrument to promote the active learning of the students and raise the level of their performance. Time is needed to check how much such innovation increases the student’s chance of getting better job positions in a time shorter than the current one for political science master graduates.

What are the lessons learned that are of interest to political scientists as organizers and developers of master courses? As far as teaching innovation is a venture made possible by additional financial resources, it is conditional to hunt for them. As researcher and as teacher, we have to apply to calls for research funds, which are greatly rewarding when awarded, as well as to calls for financing the organisation and re-organisation of courses, which are less attractive. Usually, filling with the appropriate statements the application forms of the calls for funding course organisation and teaching innovation is the task of the university administration staff. But the contribution of the teaching staff is important to make the application really innovative and successful. The administrative staff is less informed about teaching innovation than the professors that care about innovation.

Partnership with academic and non-academic institutions is essential. Synergy with a plurality of agents is key to properly enrich a degree course and make it innovative and marketable as well. The involvement of external experts takes place in the routine activities of the **GLOPEM** courses about various aspects of the programme. But in the **ReSHAPE** programme, the choice has been made of using different partnerships on the same topic, i.e. the current emergency problems and EU emergency policies. As it has been explained earlier, the reason for such a choice is to apply teaching innovation to a new set of critical issues of the contemporary world, the issues of what is changing in security and how risks and threats melt in the policy-maker response to security needs. This choice was made upon believing that synergy and partnership are really of help to teaching innovation at master level the more they enhance student education to the goal of mastering new problems for which new abilities are needed.

Notes

¹ See the **ReSHAPE** website.

² See the **GLOPEM** website.

Winning in Europe: The REScEU project

By Francesco Zucchini, 15/11/2013

Francesco Zucchini interviews Maurizio Ferrera, Professor of Comparative Welfare State at the University of Milan and an ERC Advanced grant-holder.

Zucchini: What is the project that won the ERC funding?

Ferrera: The project is entitled “Reconciling Economic and Social Europe: the role of ideas, values and politics (Resc -EU). It aims at investigating the origin and evolution within the EU of four lines of distributional conflict:

1. the conflict around market-making and market-correcting at the level of supranational institutions;
2. the conflict around EU jurisdiction/powers, on the one hand, and jurisdiction/sovereignty of national governments, on the other, in particular on fiscal and social policies;
3. the conflict between countries/systems characterized by generous welfare/high tax burden (West) and countries/systems characterized by poor welfare/low taxation (East);
4. the conflict between core countries and peripheral countries on the size and mechanisms of financial solidarity.

The analysis of these conflicts and their intertwinement will be framed in a neo Weberian theoretical perspective. This perspective not only considers macro processes and “structural” constraints, but aims at reconstructing and explaining the logic and rationality (epistemic, value-based, instrumental) of the relevant policy actors. The empirical analysis will be based on case studies, using process tracing and event structure analysis. The project will collect and analyze opinion data (an original survey of twelve countries and blog sentiment analysis will be carried out), data about political behaviors; a regular and systematic monitoring of the “intellectual” debate about the nature of the EU and its future will also be performed. In the box below you find the abstract of the project, included in the application.

Z: Is it the first time that you propose a project for European funding?

F: The first time for ERC funding. However, I have received funding as a Principal Investigator or Unit Coordinator in the fourth, fifth, sixth and seventh framework programs, for an aggregate total (since 2001) of about € 500.000.

Z: Before winning the funding had you been an evaluator? How many times?

F: I have been ERC evaluator and evaluator for other national research councils. I gave about a dozen opinions in the past decade. I never agreed to take part in the evaluation committees

of the European framework programs because you have to stay for about a week in Brussels. In hindsight, maybe I made a mistake. The share of Italian evaluators in assessment panels is very low. Although panels operate with a logic of transparency, impartiality and meritocracy, it is clear that the sensitivity of each evaluator (in respect of topics, methods, research styles, and so forth) reflects national traditions that are not equally represented in the panel. I guess that now the panel evaluators are no longer co-opted from above. They are selected by an open call. The Italian political science community should try to be more present.

Z: Do you think there are research programs within the area of social and political sciences which are more advantaged or more likely to be financed with funds from the EU?

F: The Framework Programs and the next Horizon 2020 emphasize the issues related to the goals of the so-called EU 2020 Strategy and to the agendas of the various DGs of the Commission: social and public policy in general, public administration, decision-making processes, public opinion, social inclusion and cohesion, governance, social and institutional innovation etc. I would not forget also strands of funding for more applied research, especially on social issues, labor market, energy and environmental policies, education and so on. You have to have the patience to periodically check the websites of the Commission and other EU institutions and comb through the various calls for proposal and tenders that are published almost every day. As for ERC (the “flagship” institution for research funding), the range of topics is actually open-ended: any research project, as long as it is broad, can find space and reception in calls at various levels. The calls for new grants in 2014 are going to be published soon. I urge all colleagues to consider applying.

Z: The quality of the project is obviously a necessary condition, but we suspect it is not a sufficient condition to win European funding. What practical advice can you give to other Italian political scientists? As a national scientific community what have we not yet figured out about the European selection process?

F: It is not easy to understand what are the other factors, in addition to quality, which help to determine the decisions of the panel. I limit myself to reflecting on my experience with the ERC. In this case, the panel not only evaluates the project, but also the curriculum of the applicants. At least for the advanced grants, there are minimum “thresholds” in terms of publications, career, “honors” and so on. Therefore the evaluators know the name of the applicant. They do not evaluate a project in an anonymous form but they associate it to his/her profile. In the evaluation grids, panelists are specifically asked to give an opinion on this profile as well as on the ability of the candidate to carry out the project, to supervise researchers and other staff, to manage the team, to actually build the proposed networks, to acquire the participation of other senior academics and so on. In short, with the same project quality, the best-known scholar, more visible, with higher reputation and the one who is better placed in the international networks has more chances to win. Perhaps unconsciously,

the very fact that an evaluator knows the applicant well just to have already met him or her at conferences or in meetings about other projects becomes an advantage. Of course, eventually also “luck” is important.

For Italian scholars, the lesson to be drawn is clear: more internationalization, more presence (even “physical”) in conferences, panels, seminars around Europe and the world, more networking, more integration in large multi-national projects. Publishing in high impact factor journals is a necessary condition but it is not sufficient. Internationalizing your profile is costly. You have to acquire a very good knowledge of English and maybe even of French and German, you have to spend energy and money, and sometimes you have the feeling of wasting time. The right mix between publication and participation is difficult to identify and may vary from scholar to scholar and according to different career stages. Nevertheless, especially for young people, it is good to be aware of the problem and to have an agenda.

As Italians, we are also negatively affected by the delay of our academic system and its administrative organization. Many foreign universities have support structures that help the applicants not only in the technical and organizational aspects, but also in preparing the proposals. I’m not talking about the scientific content, but about other ingredients which are very important for winning, such as the balance between basic and applied research, the composition of the team, the partnerships, the multi-disciplinary character of the proposal, etc.).

These structures have very sophisticated skills, they know the mechanisms of decision-making in Brussels and the officials of the organizations that provide the funding. They somehow get the evaluations of the projects that win, even from other universities, in order to understand what are, in fact, the evaluation criteria, the aspects that strike the attention of the evaluators. They organize seminars to train applicants, they invite them to present and discuss the draft proposal with other colleagues. A political scientist cannot learn useful scientific contents from a physicist but he/she can be inspired by his/her way of setting up the team, organizing the project, presenting it, even visually. It’s not easy to win an ERC grant at the first shot. Many grants are indeed awarded to scholars who have already applied before and make good use of the suggestions the evaluators gave them in the first round. The structures that I am talking about organize the so-called “post mortem” sessions, designed to reflect on the reasons for the rejection, on the opportunities for re- submission.

My project involved a partnership between the Centro Einaudi in Turin and the University of Milano (UNIMI). This was my luck. I could rely upon a structure of University of Torino (sponsored by the Compagnia di San Paolo) that gave me an outstanding help to define the overall framework of the project and to expand the breadth and ambition of my original idea. Without this help, this idea would not be considered “high risk, high yield “, which is what ERC wants.

Z: Is there a specific difficulty of the Italian political scientists to obtain European funding or is it just an Italian difficulty?

F: Political and social sciences have typically a share of the budget which is much smaller than other disciplines. Horizon 2020 will promote the cross-discipline integration. We will have to make an effort (Italians sometimes are a bit “picky”) to interact with economists, historians, lawyers and even the experts of life or physical sciences (e.g. by offering our skills on decision making, institutions, the social and political implications of change in general).

Z: The funding is very significant. How broadly will it be used?

F: Approximately 500.000 will be used to reimburse the University of Milano for my labor costs. So for 4 years I will be able to work only on the project for half of my job time and for another year I can work fully on the project by taking a sabbatical. About one million will be used to recruit other researchers at UNIMI and the Centro Einaudi. About 300.000 for a survey and other forms of opinion survey. The rest for travel, conferences, secretary, dissemination, overheads and so on.

Z: Are you concerned about the administrative burden that the financial report entails?

F: Quite worried, but I trust in the possibility of recruiting a project secretary. Moreover the new General University Manager has promised a substantial upgrading of University administrative offices (UNIMI).

Z: For the social sciences in general, and political science in particular, it is not a good period in terms of funding, not only in Italy. What can we do to raise awareness with regard to the utility of our research?

F: In Italy mass media are the only channel for reaching public opinion at large. For political scientists, however, using the mass media may be a double-edged weapon. An economist can say foolish things without sounding like a smoke-seller, but we run the risk of sounding foolish even when we say smart things. It is a consequence of the low level of institutionalization of political science, still barely recognizable even in its name (in the singular). Perhaps it is more fruitful to try and press on policy makers, in Italy and in Europe, (We have more audience and reputation in Brussels than in Rome or Milan) in order to be considered a full-fledged bearers of expert knowledge, useful for public, collective decisions. Perhaps a greater effort of SISP and ECPR on this issue could improve our reputation, on which also funding for basic research ultimately depends.

Purpose of the *RESc-EU Project*:

Reconciling Economic and Social Europe: the role of ideas, values and politics

The welfare state (WS) and the EU are two precious legacies of the XX century. Their mutual relationship has been however fraught by unresolved tensions (and a potential “clash”), which the recent crisis seems to have markedly exacerbated. The project purpose is to develop a new theory on the genetic roots of such tensions, their temporal swings, the possible institutional solutions and their political pre-conditions.

The WS serves essential economic, social and political functions. The EU (EMU in particular) is in its turn essential for growth and jobs, but tends to undermine the WS's very institutional foundations. When, how and why did the initial “elective affinity” between the two spheres start to weaken? Is “reconciliation” possible and how? The project will focus on the intellectual and political dynamics of both WS-building and EU-building. Drawing on Weber's insights on the relationship between values, ideas, and politics, a new framework will be elaborated, aimed at reconnecting these three elements in the explanation of change, thus breaking new grounds in institutional theories. Extensive empirical work will be

carried out, based on a multi-disciplinary approach (political science, political philosophy, policy analysis, law and economics). Detailed case studies will reconstruct the logic of key past junctures, such as the crisis of the 1970s, the years between the Amsterdam and the Lisbon Treaties, the post-2008 crisis. Public attitudes on the EU's social dimensions will be tapped through a survey and a "Blog Sentiment Analysis". Academic and expert networks will be involved as well as EU policy makers, in order to discuss the scientific and policy implications of the project results. Policy documentation, assessment and proposals will be produced through an observatory ("EUvisions") for systematic data collection and analysis on (social) EU-building "in action".

T.wai research on emerging patterns of insecurity

By Stefano Ruzza, 15/11/2013

T.wai is an independent, non-profit institute founded in 2009 by a group of International Relations scholars based in Turin, through a grant provided by Compagnia di San Paolo. Originally conceived as a spin-off and an enlargement of the activity previously conducted in the frame of «**Laboratorio di Politica Globale**» (LPG) of the Centro Einaudi (CE), it is dedicated to rigorous academic and policy-oriented research in the fields of international relations, area and security studies. The acronym “T.wai”, standing for “**Torino World Affairs Institute**”, hints about the location of the institute headquarters and, as per its mandate, T.wai cooperates intensely with the University based in the same city (especially the Department of Culture, Politics and Society – CPS), contributing to enhance educational outreach, academic networking and research output. The deep interconnections between the two institutions are also testified by the academic position of the Institute six founding members and Heads of research, each of them faculty at the University of Turin as well.

The Institute’s activities are organized around three macro-areas: “**Emerging actors**”, focused on assessing the impact of China and India on global governance in the age of power diffusion; “**Global politics**”, whose aim is to investigate the actors, rules, dynamics and narratives that shape politics at the global level, and “**Violence and security**”, dealing specifically with emerging trends in transnational security: from the rise of non-state actors to force privatization. The Heads of research for each area are, respectively: Giovanni Andornino and Giuseppe Gabusi (Emerging Actors), Irene Bono and Anna Caffarena (Global politics), Fabio Armao and me (Violence and security).

T.wai is mostly known to the Italian public through the publication of its bi-monthly periodicals in cooperation with the Istituto Affari Internazionali (IAI) of Rome: “**OrizzonteCina**” and “**IndiaIndie**”. Thanks to its established partnership with the prestigious Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI), T.wai also has a stronger element contributing to its outreach: the translation into Italian of the renowned **SIPRI Yearbook Summary**, on-going since 2011 and released each year in Fall. All of T.wai’s publications are freely available for download on [T.wai’s website](#).

Another way through which the Institute has achieved widespread recognition, both in Italy and abroad, is the organization, management and conduction of an intensive two-weeks summer school concerted with the University of Turin and the CPS Department: “**Engaging Conflict**”. The program is aimed at providing advanced tools to critically understand conflict and tackle it as a dynamic reality. The **SS Engaging Conflict**, running since 2012 and of which the third edition will be held in July 2014, has made possible to invite world renowned scholars like Mats Berdal (King’s College London), Christopher Coker (London School of Economics) and A.J.R. Groom (University of Kent), along with many others, to lecture in Turin on a regular basis. The program also provides an excellent opportunity to attract students from abroad and mix them with their Italian colleagues interested in the same topics.

In my capacity of Head of Research in the “Violence and security” area, I personally supervise the Italian translation of the Yearbook Summary and thus maintain the working relationship with SIPRI. I also take care of the organization and coordination – both scientific and practical – of the “Engaging Conflict” summer school, defining the group of scholars and experts taking part in each session and making the related agreements. In terms of **research activity**, the main program currently on-going in the “Violence and security” area is called “**The Emerging Patterns of Insecurity Dialogue**” or, for short, **EPID**. It is jointly run by T.wai and the *Mario Einaudi Center for International Studies*(**MECIS**) at Cornell University, and its roots are in a memorandum of understanding signed between MECIS and T.wai in 2010. On that basis, a dialogue aimed at defining thematic areas of mutual interest was started, and for this reason I was hosted as a Visiting Scholar in Cornell in the Fall of 2010. I had to pursue two goals back then: on

the one hand, to strengthen the **MECIS-T.wai** core partnership; while on the other to define – together with Cornell scholars – where to set the joint research focus. Given the heart of the “Violence and security” area that I represent, and of my specific scientific interests, the broad theme on which to converge was found within the changing role of non-state armed organizations (**NSAOs**) in today’s world and on their impact on the political and social spheres. At the same time, it was also deemed appropriate to scientifically extend **EPID** activities beyond Cornell and T.wai, with the objective of building a trans-Atlantic network of scholars interested in the topic and in the joint production of scientific knowledge. Hence, during the time spent in Ithaca, contacts were made also with scholars affiliated with other major American universities, such as Brown, Columbia and Harvard.

The **German Marshall Fund** of the United States generously co-financed the **EPID start-up phase**, with a grant specifically aimed at launching the project. As a first major step, it was agreed to setup a workshop in Turin in the Spring of 2011, where scholars involved in the network could have a first face-to-face exchange on topics of common interest. On the basis of the exploratory talks in Cornell, a background paper organizing questions around four core-themes on the ontology of non-state armed organizations; management of violence and violent choices; patterns of NSAO strengthening, growth and resilience; and analysis of the specific NSAO-state relationship was prepared and provided to all the invited participants of the first workshop. In May 2011 eighteen scholars and experts, from both the Americas and Europe, convened for the first time in Turin to effectively start the “dialogue” and begin to better define the joint field of research.

Based on the outcomes of the first workshop, efforts of further topic refinement and of coordination among the participating persons and institutions were conducted, all the way up to the end of 2012. Among other things, an **EPID planning committee** was created, constituted by Fabio Armao (T.wai and University of Turin), Diane Davis (Harvard University), Charles Geisler (Cornell University), Anja Jakobi (Peace Research Institute Frankfurt – PRIF), Kimberly Marten (Columbia University) and myself. I personally went to Cornell again twice in 2012 to keep *in tune* the co ordination between MECIS and T.wai. The director of MECIS, Fredrik Logevall, has been a steady supporter of EPID, and much help has also been provided by Heike Michelsen and all of the staff working at MECIS. During 2012, as a spinoff of EPID and on the base of some of the issues the dialogue contributed to bringing to the foreground, a panel was organized and presented in the frame of the *British International Studies Association (BISA)* Convention held in Edinburgh in **June 2012** by a few EPID members.

The main results of the first conference and the exchange sparkling from it and following it were placing under question the Weberian notion that states truly exercise a monopoly on the use of force considered legitimate by society. Starting from this, it was decided to organize a second workshop, two years after the first one. The idea was to tackle the issue from a multi-disciplinary perspective, examining the roles of non-state actors in providing governance in the spheres of security and violent claim making, and this time to organize the discussion in a more customary way, around papers presented by the participants, organized in thematic panels.

Leading scholars from both sides of the Atlantic and across several disciplines convened in Turin again in **May 2013** under the auspices of both T.wai and MECIS to polish up the work done up to then in studying non-state violence, security and governance challenges. MECIS provided a financial grant to support the event, while T.wai covered the rest of the expenses and took care of all the logistics and organization. Three Cornell contributors took part in the workshop (Gustavo Flores-Macias, Charles Geisler and Michael Jones-Correa) and two from T.wai (Fabio Armao and myself). The core Cornell-T.wai group was complemented by another twelve scholars and researchers, coming from the most prestigious academic institutions and think-tanks. These participants, listed besides their affiliation, were: Peter Andreas (Brown University), Edgardo Buscaglia (Instituto Tecnológico Autónomo de México – ITAM and Columbia University), Diane Davis (Harvard University), Giampiero Giacomello (University of Bologna), Peter Chalk (RAND Corporation), Sarah Daly (Columbia University), Alexandra Gheciu (University of Ottawa), José Miguel Cruz (Florida International University), Anja Jakobi (Peace Research Institute Frankfurt –

PRIF), Kimberly Marten (Columbia University), Paolo Mazzuferi (Post-Conflict Operations Study Center, Italian Army) and Vincenzo Ruggiero (Middlesex University).

At the present time, and with the **second EPID workshop** just six months in the past, the main planned output for the coming future is a volume edited by Charles Geisler, Anja Jakobi (who has moved meantime from PRIF to Royal Holloway, London) and myself. The **book** will gather the results of the joint work developed in the frame of EPID so far, and will attempt to gain its own niche in the literature on non-state actors and global governance. Although a considerable number of work have already appeared on the future of states facing security challenges from non-state actors, there is little treatment of the fate of the state system as a reigning world order and interpretative paradigm. Similarly, there is a sprawling scholarship on violence, crime, and corrupt state rule, yet few have comprehended these challenges as transformative at a global scale and – beyond critiques of state-centrism – as a potential source of alternative legitimacy. The cases introduced in the book, and originally discussed in the second workshop, challenge ‘Westphalian conservatism’ in a provocative and plausible manner. The intent of the book is to stir a major debate on global political change, regarding what might fill the governance void occasioned by such change and – above all – the very effectiveness of ‘Westphalianism’ as an interpretative paradigm.

The open-ended conclusion that emerged from the EPID project so far is that **new sovereign interests**, diverse in nature but similar in their resort to violence, **are building a base which is hostile to Westphalian conservatism**. But this reversal of conventional governance and legitimacy carries uncertainties in its womb. From one perspective the surge in non-state agency can induce resilience within the Westphalian state-system as it staves off disorder. From another, this agency foreshadows a replacement system that, although still inchoate, may have its “upsides”. In conclusion, although “jackals” are widely portrayed in pejorative terms – as scavengers living off dead bodies – they are indispensable to the maintenance and evolution of the ecosystem of which they are a part. The analogy invites reflection: **non-states actors** – even of the criminal, armed, or violent kind – **can be essential to the upkeep or to the transformation of existing models of social and political organization**. This is not just the core argument of the EPID-based book proposal, but is also the departure point from which the “dialogue” will stay on-going in the coming future.

The EPID book proposal is currently under review by one major international scientific publisher and is not the only output in the making. An **EPID-related panel** has been submitted and accepted in the frame of the next **International Studies Association (ISA)** convention to be held in **Toronto** in late March 2014, and the group is currently working in drafting another panel for the American Political Science (APSA) meeting scheduled for late August in Washington DC. The international collaboration between the Mario Einaudi Center for International Studies, T.wai, and all the partners institutions and individuals involved in “The Emerging Patterns of Insecurity Dialogue” project will continue, in keeping with the potent set of intellectual and policy challenges animated by non-state armed activity and expansion.

The teaching of EU and International Politics in Italy and abroad: a personal experience

By [Simona Piattoni](#), 15/11/2013

Throughout my career I have had the opportunity to get to know four university systems – those of the US, Norway, Austria and Italy – from direct experience either as a student or as a lecturer (or both). Unfortunately, at various stages of my career, I was interested in slightly different sub-disciplines of political science, so my impressions are more spotty than what would be ideal in order to draw a systematic comparison between these systems. So, please, take the following as anecdotal evidence at best. My personal experience may in fact put me at a particular disadvantage for the task at hand – assessing the teaching of EU and International Politics abroad – as I will try to show.

When I was studying for my doctorate in Political Science in the United States I was unfortunately not very interested in European or International Politics, as my main fields of specialization were Political Economy and Comparative Politics – and this may have been just as well. At MIT, International Relations were a big subject: the *Department of Political Science* had been created basically as an intelligence-gathering unit for the CIA and the Secretary of State during World War II, so the type of IR studied there was familiarly designated as “*bombs and rockets*”. After the war, it was felt that a different type of knowledge was needed, so the Department began to develop comparative politics, political economy, public policy and the other political science sub-disciplines. Unfortunately, the strong mainstream IR and CP traditions had attracted to MIT scholars who considered the nation-state as the main significant unit of analysis, thus preventing them from appreciating the innovativeness of the European integration project. As a consequence, no one taught EU studies at MIT at least until the mid-1990s (and even now it remains a marginal focus). Much attention was rather devoted to the comparative analysis of individual economic and political systems and their interrelations, so that through the backdoor of International Political Economy some (trade and production related) international politics crept back in.

During those years I gained an appreciation for the interconnectedness of domestic and international policies: in particular, I learnt how international developments affect domestic politics – what was at the time termed, with Peter Gourevitch, the “second image reversed” – and these in turn shape international developments. Even at Harvard, where I spent some time at the *Center for European Studies*, “European studies” meant the study of Germany, France, Britain, Italy and Spain (and, occasionally, some other countries), but hardly of the European Union. After all, at Harvard taught Stanley Hoffmann, who thought that the nation-state had not become “obsolete” as a consequence of the European integration project, and Andrew Moravcsik, who has always considered the Union fundamentally as an exceptionally institutionalized international organization, but an international organization nevertheless. Frankly, I had heard more about the European Economic Community during my Economics studies at Bocconi in the 1980s when, at least, I attended the course of Economics of the European Community taught then by Carlo Secchi.

My second experience took me possibly even further away from EU studies than my American years. My first teaching appointment was at the University of Tromsø, Norway, the “northernmost university in the world”. I arrived in September 1994, when the campaign «*Nej til EU*» (“No to the EU”) was in full swing. The October 1994 referendum gave the expected negative result (with 80% of the voters opposed to joining the EU in northern Norway) just a couple of months after both Sweden and Finland had voted instead to join. The University of Tromsø had no political science course in EU studies – again, only in International Relations conventionally understood and in Comparative Politics – and did not feel the need to activate one. The powerhouse for the study of the European Union, in Norway, was obviously located in Oslo, within the ARENA (*Advanced Research on the Europeanization of the Nation State*) project. Johan P. Olsen, Erik Oddvar Eriksen, John Erik Fossum and many others had understood the significance of the European

Union and were supporting and conducting research on it. Once again, I could nevertheless gain a certain insight into some of the issues that occupied also EU scholars by interacting with my Norwegian colleagues interested in the Nordic fisheries regimes and with the joint governance arrangements, among the states at the borders of the Northern Calotte, regarding commercial routes and ecological issues linked to the Arctic and the North Pole. While the common border with Russia still steered IR research and teaching interests towards fairly classic security studies, the post-1989 context was simultaneously re-directing my IR colleagues towards the exploration of new governance regimes and constructivist theories. Interestingly, I witnessed for the first time in my professional experience a serious commitment towards lifelong learning, with the training of military personnel stationed in the numerous military bases in the Arctic for the new tasks that awaited them, such as peace-keeping and environmental security.

It was only when I spent two years at the European University Institute (EUI) as visiting fellow that I was fully exposed to EU studies. What a steep learning curve did I have to climb! There, everyone knew obviously everything about the Union. These were the years during which the supranational approach of Wayne Sandholtz and Alec Stone-Sweet yielded the two volumes in the Oxford University Press series and identity and citizenship issues were being explored by Thomas Risse and Anna Triandafyllidou, respectively, and by many others. And, yet, for another wicked twist of events, not even then did I engage directly with European studies. I rather approached EU studies from the backdoor, through my interest in regional development policy, studying cohesion policy and ultimately multi-level governance (or, as I called it back then, being still influenced by my studies on clientelism, *informal governance*). Yet, EU studies were all around me. While clearly not by any means an EU expert, I realized that I could still make a contribution by offering insights, suggesting mechanisms and asking questions that I derived from my cultivation of comparative politics. The European Union offered to the comparativist an ideal context in which one could study the responses of the various member states or of the various regions to identical stimuli. This agenda, that we could today indicate with the label of Europeanization studies, has been the obvious port of entry from comparative politics into EU studies. Moreover, I came to realize at EUI that EU studies are at least as much a field of political science as they are a field of law, something that struck me at the time as rather bizarre (no more).

My real training in EU studies, then, has taken place while at the University of Trento thanks to the research that I carried out with colleagues at that and other universities (Siena, Milano, Pavia) in a series of PRIN projects and in a series on EU-funded projects with colleagues of other European universities and, finally, teaching courses in EU Politics and Theories of European Integration at Master's and PhD level in Trento. It is true that you do not really learn something until you have to teach it! But once again, perhaps because I taught to students with a mixed social science background, teaching EU studies was more an exercise in questioning received wisdom than simply passing on scholarly certainties. What emerged with extreme clarity was that the distinction between the two disciplines that have dominated Political Science during the postwar period – Comparative Politics and International Relations – had become blurred and that EU scholars need to be conversant with both of them as well as with other disciplines. Ontological and epistemological certainties were also shaken, first and foremost the centrality of the nation-state as an agent of regulation and change.

But the real jump to EU studies was marked for me by my accepting the Chair in European Integration Politics at the University of Innsbruck in 2010. There my entire teaching load had to do, one way or another, with the EU at BA, MA and PhD levels. Also in Innsbruck, though, the MA curriculum in European Politics did not offer many teachings that would be necessary to form real EU experts. Next to the fundamental knowledge of EU institutions, procedures and processes, students should also *really* learn EU politics, that is patterns of domestic and transnational mobilization around EU issues, Euro-parties and European elections, inter-institutional bargaining, political theory of integration processes, and so on. It is very rare to find in Italy (and even abroad, at least judging from my own experience) curricula that offer the full gamut of topics necessary to form veritable EU experts.

What then can I conclude from my personal experience? Admittedly, it has been a very peculiar experience which has not taken me to the real hubs of EU studies. Still, there are a number of conclusions I may tentatively draw. First, EU studies offer a wonderful opportunity for broadening one's scientific horizons: one has to study many political science sub-disciplines and also venture into related disciplines, but most certainly one must escape the strictures of the dichotomy between International Relations and Comparative Politics. Second, it may not be a bad idea to cultivate a certain breadth of knowledge beyond the European Union, as this remains a political project that may eventually be challenged and even peter out. Third, we never stop learning, and we learn most when we have to teach.

Learning in English: Italian (and German) Educational supply in Political Science

By Francesco Zucchini, 15/11/2013

After the Bologna and Lisbon Processes, the internationalization of higher education has become a sort of refrain in the rhetoric that accompanies the continuous reforms of the sector in Italy. Indeed, true internationalization implies several features that make a higher education system effective and attractive. Internationalizing a domestic education system means primarily to make domestic graduates ready to compete not only in the domestic, but also in the European and international job and research market and, at the same time, to make the domestic university system able to attract (for the same reasons) the best foreign students. The key factors of the internationalization of higher education are therefore strictly connected with the concept of mobility. This means that different types of barriers must be lowered. On the one hand there are entry barriers, on the other there are output barriers.

Entry barriers prevent universities to attract the best candidates irrespectively from their country of origin. Output barriers prevent the best graduates in the national universities to find in the European and international market a job position that fits their skills and level of proficiency. Of course, the two types of barriers are strictly interconnected. Examples of the first type of barriers are university fees, life cost, accommodation expenses, and complexity of the bureaucratic procedures. Examples of the second type are low quality of educational supply, low university reputation. The main type of barrier that works both as entry and output barrier is the linguistic one. Teaching in English is not really a sufficient condition for a good level of internationalization, but it is quite always a necessary condition. It is also the most reliable information we have to evaluate the degree of internationalization of the Italian higher education in general, and in Political Science in particular. In the rest of this contribution we try to evaluate the “**Englishization**” of Bachelor and Master courses in which at least one class in Political Science is taught. We will try to compare Political Science with other fields of study and Italy with Germany. Our data come from two official websites: [University](#) and [DAAD](#) (both purposely designed for domestic and foreign students). We consider only university courses that are fully in English and with the standard European duration, that is, 3 years Bachelors and 2 years Masters. Professional paths as Medicine and Law that last 5 years have been added to the Bachelor course category.

Table 1. Bachelor and Master courses in Italy by scientific area

	Total BA/BS c	BA/BSc i n English	Total MA/MS c	MA/MSc i n English	Agreements wit h other Univs.
Math and Computer Science	89	0	73	9	3
Physics	46	0	54	6	1
Chemistry	76	0	75	2	1
Earth Sciences	73	0	49	1	1
Biology	185	2	123	5	2
Medicine	564	8	160	5	1
Agriculture, Veterinary Medicine	114	0	87	4	3

Civil Engineering and Architecture	156	0	142	11	0
Industrial and information engineering	214	1	285	33	7
Humanities	188	0	257	0	0
History, Philosophy and Psychology	191	0	242	3	0
Law	117	0	n.a.	0	0
Economics and Statistics	189	4	277	36	6
Political and Social Sciences	179	1	175	11	3
Total	2381	16	1999	126	28

In the Italian system of higher education the presence of courses in English is still very marginal. Very few courses at Bachelor level are supplied in English and most of them are 5 year courses in Medicine. At the Master level, the courses in English increase, but they do not reach the 7% out of the total of the two year Master courses offered by the Italian university system. While in Italy Bachelor and Master courses in English are less than 150, the German educational system offers 587 courses fully in English. What about social and political sciences in general and political science in particular? Given a general low propensity of the Italian university system to offer courses in English, does this field of studies have a better or worse performance compared with others?

Table 2. Weight of each scientific area on the overall supply (in general and only in English language) in Italy, in percentages

	Bachelor	Master	Bachelor in English	Master in English
Math and Computer Science	3.74	3.65	0.00	7.14
Physics	1.93	2.70	0.00	4.76
Chemistry	3.19	3.75	0.00	1.59
Earth Sciences	3.07	2.45	0.00	0.79
Biology	7.77	6.15	12.50	3.97
Medicine	23.69	8.00	50.00	3.97

Agriculture, Veterinary Medicine	4.79	4.35	0.00	3.17
Civil Engineering and Architecture	6.55	7.10	0.00	8.73
Industrial and information engineering	8.99	14.26	6.25	26.19
Humanities	7.90	12.86	0.00	0.00
History, Philosophy and Psychology	8.02	12.11	0.00	2.38
Law	4.91	0.00	0.00	0.00
Economics and Statistics	7.94	13.86	25.00	28.57
Political and Social Sciences	7.52	8.75	6.25	8.73
Total	100	100	100	100

Table 2 shows a great variance among the different fields of studies in Italy. While Masters in economics are almost 14% of all Master courses, those taught in English are almost 30% of all Masters in English. Other courses that show a clear higher propensity to be taught in English are Medicine and Industrial and Information Engineering. Courses in Political and Social Sciences are present in the same proportion both among the overall number of Bachelor and Master courses and among the courses only in English (they are the 8,75% among all two year Masters and the 8,73% among those in English). Therefore we cannot see any particular propensity, either positive or negative. However, almost all English courses in Political and Social Sciences include credits in Political Science. On the contrary, other social sciences like Sociology are almost always absent.

Table 3. Italian higher education programs in English: the presence of Political Science by university seats, credits and cooperation with foreign universities plus fees

University	PoIS ci ECT S	Programme Title	Cooper. w/ other Univ s.	Fees
Catania	30	Double Master's Degree in Global Politics and Euro-Mediterranean Relations	Yes	Depending on income
Milan	30	Economics and Political Science	No	From €689 to €3681/year
Pavia	27	World Politics and International Relations	No	From €484 to €3074/year
Padova	21	Human rights and Multi-Level Governance	No	From €571 to €2455/year
Padova	18	Local Development	Yes	From €571 to €2455/year
Trento	14	Master's Degree in	No	From €582 to

European and International Studies			o €2808/year	
Palermo	12	Managing sustainable development in public and private organisations	No	NA
Venezia	12	International Relations	No	Max €1883/year
Bologna	8	Interdisciplinary research and study on Eastern Europe	Yes	From €0 to €4366/year
Firenze	6	Master of Science in Development Economics	No	NA
Rome (Tor Vergata)	6	Global Governance (Bachelor)	No	From €5462 to €6767/year

Looking at the list of universities that decide to offer a Master Degree in Political and Social Sciences in English, we might ask why them and not others. One possible explanation could be based upon the existence of a positive attitude of the local university towards the internationalization. Therefore, we should find a positive correlation between the number of courses in English in other scientific fields and the presence of an English course in Political and Social Sciences.

Table 4. Italian Universities with programs entirely in English

University	Programs in English with Political Science	Programs in English
Bologna	1	12
Calabria	0	1
Catania	1	4
Firenze	1	4
Genova	0	4
Milano (Statale)	1	2
Milano (Bocconi)	0	4
Milano (Cattolica)	0	3
Milano (Politecnico)	0	5
Padova	2	8
Palermo	1	1
Pavia	1	7
Pisa	0	4
Roma «La Sapienza»	0	5
Roma «Tor Vergata»	1	10
Roma LUISS	0	2
Salerno	0	1
Siena	0	4
Torino	0	9
Trento	1	12
Trieste	0	2
Venezia Ca' Foscari	1	3

Looking at the table, it is pretty clear that there is not any strong correlation. For instance, in the universities of Palermo, Milano and Venezia there is a Master in Political and Social Sciences fully taught in English although English programs in other fields are very few. On the contrary, in Torino nine courses in English in other scientific areas do not induce any local political scientist toward the emulation.

Another obvious explanation is based upon the number of scholars in Political Science who work in each university. We should expect that when scholars are numerous it is easier setting up a demanding

initiative as an English course. This second expectation is partially confirmed. Pearson correlation index is not too high (0,48) but it is significant.

Table 5. Italian Universities by presence of programs in English with Political Science and number of political scientists

University	Courses in English with Political Science	Number of Political Scientists
Bologna	1	37
Cagliari	0	2
Calabria	0	5
Catania	1	12
Firenze	1	12
Genova	0	3
Macerata	0	3
Messina	0	3
Milano (Statale)	1	18
Milano (Bocconi)	0	1
Milano (Cattolica)	0	4
Milano (Politecnico)	0	2
Napoli «Federico II»	0	5
Napoli «L'Orientale»	0	2
Napoli «Parthenope»	0	2
Napoli «Seconda Università»	0	1
Padova	2	11
Palermo	1	2
Pavia	1	7
Pisa	0	4
Roma «La Sapienza»	0	4
Roma «Tor Vergata»	1	1
Roma LUISS	0	4
Roma «Tre»	0	4
Salerno	0	3
Sassari	0	3
Scuola Superiore Sant'Anna	0	2
Siena	0	5
Univ. per Stranieri, Perugia	0	2
Torino	0	17
Trento	1	7
Trieste	0	7
Tuscia	0	2
Università Telematica Guglielmo Marconi	0	1
Università Telematica UNITELMA Sapienza	0	1
Università del Piemonte Orientale	0	1
Urbino «Carlo Bo»	0	4
Valle d'Aosta	0	1
Venezia Ca' Foscari	1	2

Also in Germany very few Bachelors in Political Science (3) are fully taught in English. The number of Master courses classified as courses in Political Science is almost threefold compared to the Italian one (32 versus 11). However, the weight of these courses over the whole supply in English is even lower than in Italy (around 5% versus 8.73%). These data suggest that in Italy the courses in Political and Social Sciences in English are few, mostly because of the size of the scholarly community in Political Science rather than because of a peculiar reluctance of the Italian political scientists compared to other communities of political scientists as the German one. This preliminary result, however, must be investigated more in depth, as the importance of Political Science in Master courses that vaguely recall the presence of political topics in the title can vary widely. In table 3 we classified all the Italian courses that include at least a class in Political Science according to the number of credits in the formal sector of Political Science (SPS/o4). In three cases the presence of Political Science is very marginal (Bologna, Firenze, Roma Tor Vergata). Among the courses (8) in which Political Science is worth more than nine credits, four are dedicated to European and international affairs. Only in three Universities (Catania, Milano and Pavia) Political science is worth around 30 credits.

Table 6. German programs in English with Political Science by university, presence of cooperation with other foreign universities and fees (programs in which Political Science is marginal are emphasised in dark green)

University	Programme Title	Cooper. w/ other Un ivs.	Fees
Bamberg	Double Master's Degree in Governance and International Politics	Yes	Varied
Cologne (Köln)	Double Master's Programme in Political Science (European Studies)	Yes	Varied
Duisburg	MA in Contemporary East Asian Studies – MA in Modern East Asian Studies	No	None
Erfurt	Master of Science in Politics, Economics and Philosophy	No	From €1000 to €2000/semester
Flensburg	Master of Arts – Master of Social Science in European Studies	Yes	None
Freiberg	MBA International Business in Developing and Emerging Markets (IBDEM)	Yes	None
Freiburg	Environmental Governance (MEG)	No	None
Freie Universität – Berlin	Online MA in East European Studies	No	From €2000 to €3000/semester
	Online MA in International Relations	No	From €4000 to €5000/semester
Giessen	MSc in Transition Management	No	None
Goethe University Frankfurt	Master of Modern East Asian Studies (MEAS)	No	None
Göttingen	Erasmus Mundus Master of Euroculture: Europe in the Wider World	Yes	Varied
	MA in Modern Indian Studies	No	Up to €500/semester

			ter
Hamburg	Master of Science in Politics, Economics and Philosophy	No	None
Hertie School of Governance (Berlin)	Master of Public Policy (MPP)	No	From €5000 to €7500/semester
	Executive Master of Public Management (EMPM)	Yes	Varied
Humboldt University Berlin	GeT MA – German Turkish Master's Programmes in Social Sciences	Yes	From €2000 to €3000/semester
	Global Studies Programme	Yes	Varied
Humboldt-Viadrina School of Governance	Master of Public Policy	No	From €4000 to €5000/semester
Jacobs University Bremen	BA in Integrated Social Sciences (ISS)	No	From €7500 to €10000/semester
	International Relations: Global Governance and Social Theory (MA)	No	None
Kassel	MA in Global Political Economy	No	None
Konstanz	Master's Programme European Master in Government	Yes	Varied
Leipzig	BA in American Studies	No	None
	BA in International Politics and History (IPH)	No	From €7500 to €10000/semester
	MA in American Studies	No	None
Mannheim	MA in Political Science	Yes	None
Marburg	Master of Peace and Conflict Studies (International Double Award)	Yes	Varied
Passau	MA in Southeast Asian Studies	No	None
Regensburg	MA in European-American Studies	No	None
Siegen	Roads to Democracy(ies) – International Master's Programme in History, Political Science and Sociology	Yes	None
Trier	MA in International Economics and Public Policy	No	None
	Master of Science in Economics – European Political Economy	No	None
University of Hohenheim Stuttgart	Master of Science in Economics	No	None
Witten/Herdecke University	MA in Philosophy, Politics and Economics	No	From €5000 to €7500/semester

German programs websites do not always allow to identify as precisely as for Italy the weight of Political Science, but a careful reading of the structure of studies suggests that in at least 16 programs out of 35 this field of studies is marginal. In fact, several programs are area studies programs in which a country or a world region is studied according to a plurality of disciplinary approaches. Among the other 19 programs the variety of subfields seems slightly wider than in Italy and 12 programs have established

stable networks of cooperation with universities of other countries. In Italy, only two programs in which Political Science is relatively important display these same characteristics (in the universities of Catania and Padova). Last but not least, in Germany tuition fees vary enormously among different universities, but it is remarkable that 7 programs are completely free. In Italy fees usually are not very high, but no program is completely free.

Conclusion

Political Science courses in Italy are less “Englished” (internationalized) than courses in other scientific disciplines. However, they do not seem less “Englished” than in Germany considered that the scholarly community in Italy is much smaller. Some challenges must be faced in order to make competitive the attempt to internationalize the Italian programs in Political Science. First of all, Italian scholars have to fight against the extreme fragmentation of the teaching of this discipline in the Italian universities. We observed that the probability to offer a Master in the English language depends partially on the size of the scholarly community in each university. Inter-university networks could be a suitable solution against fragmentation, as it creates the critical mass necessary to promote new initiatives. Second, Italian universities must cooperate much more strictly with other universities abroad. Such a type of cooperation improves their reputation and makes their programs much more attractive for Italian and foreign students. Third, the fees policy of some very good programs in Political Science in Germany is very attractive. Italian Political scientists (and more in general the academic community) should make policy makers aware of the necessity, at least in some cases, to curb the enrolment fees and to multiply the fellowships unless they prefer to reject not only the best students from other countries, but even the best Italian students in favor of the universities in Germany and other northern European countries.

Evaluating the evaluators. A comment on the final report of the Group of evaluators of the area 14 – Political and Social Sciences (Call VQR 2004-2010)

By Liborio Mattina, 15/11/2013

Introduction

An article by Monteleone, Panebianco and Zucchini appeared in May 2013 of Italian Political Science (IPS) entitled «**Evaluating the Evaluation. The Pros and Cons of 'VQR' in Social and Political Research**». The article exposes some general reflections about the benefits and limitations of peer review, indices of impact and bibliometric classifications.

The article does not examine, however, the evaluation work carried out by the political and social scientists who, in representation of “area” 14, participated as experts in the Groups of expert evaluators (Gev) constituted by Anvur (The National Agency for evaluation of University and Research). Gevs, as is known, were established to examine the thousands of works delivered by the scientific communities of the Italian university, in accordance with the provisions of the **Call VQR 2004-2010**. But at the time of the publication of Monteleone and associates' article the Gev final evaluations were not yet available.

In the early summer of 2013, Anvur published on its website the final reports drawn up by all the Fourteen Gevs. This publication makes it possible to resume some observations contained in the Monteleone and associates' article for outlying a few comments on the work carried out by the Gev 14, the group which examined the works of the Italian political scientists, along with those of practitioners in related disciplines. According to the Gev 14 report, the general performance of our community shows a «not very bright (final) result» (p. 63).

In these few lines I will focus on deficiencies issued during the process of evaluation that were caused, in my opinion, by the criteria and processes accepted by Gev 14 for evaluating the research of our scientific community. My analysis aims to discuss those criteria and processes for drawing the attention of the Italian political science analysts on to the need to promote some major improvements in the job of research evaluation.

These improvements will be more effective if they arise from a general debate that would involve the largest number of scholars possible. A broad participation is desirable in order to avoid a passive adoption of inadequate instruments of evaluation that could have a permanently negative impact on the way in which the scientific community will assess itself, on the allocation of ministerial funds to the university structures and on the reliability of judgments on the work of researchers.

The evaluation criteria

The three evaluation criteria on which Gev 14 made their judgments are known: scientific relevance, originality and degree of internationalization. The first two contain the risk that it is inevitable to assign challenging value judgments to people who do not necessarily represent the prevailing opinion among experts of a given scientific community. To minimize this risk, each of the three individual works forwarded by the Italian political scientists to Anvur was entrusted for evaluation to two different reviewers recruited by the Gev. In other words, the products conferred by each scholar to Anvur for the evaluation were examined by six different people and, in case of open conflicting judgments, entrusted to the final judgment of a consensus group specially drawn up by the Gev. In short, everything possible was done to minimize the risk of clearly discretionary evaluations.

The consequences resulting from the use of the internationalization criterion, namely “interest and international visibility” of the individual works deserves a different consideration. The negative consequences resulting from “adoption of such a criterion were such that – remarks Gev 14 – in many cases, the publication in the Italian language led to penalize – with a very low rating on the internationalization criterion – works that had gained the most in reference to the other two criteria” (p. 63). In other words, Gev 14 states that many excellent works were downgraded because they have no “international visibility”.

It is a shame that Gev 14 noticed only ex-post the risks arising from inadvertently endorsing the naïf assumption that all that is written in the English language contains a surplus of ‘science’ that is missing in the works written in the Italian language. Prompt Gev 14 intervention at Anvur could have prevented the adoption of a criterion that has proved to be heavily penalizing towards the scholars of political and social sciences. On the other hand, Gev 14 could have warned the reviewers recruited for the peer review to utilize such a controversial criterion with due caution. No suggestion has been offered in this regard. Only after the trouble occurred, did the Gev 14 regret not having been able to operationalize a concept whose “difficult application” may have “put off track” the reviewers (p. 65). They, moreover, presented in many cases assessments without any reasoned argument, although it was possible to add comments to the judgment resulting from the sum of the partial judgments based on the three standardized criteria.

The final report does not provide indications for attempting a quantifiable statement of the damage resulting from the adoption of a controversial criterion and from superficial behavior shown by many reviewers in the formulation of judgments. In any case, considering that nearly 60% of the products conferred to Anvur for evaluation by scholars referring to political science – and 73.5% of all works related to the sub-sector political science – were written in Italian, one can imagine the scale of distortions generated by the criterion “internationalization”.

The evaluation process

The evaluation process focused on peer review and was accompanied, when possible, by bibliometric analysis. However, it appears – from the Gev 14 final report – that peer review, when applied to large numbers (the products referred to the SPS/04 sub-group were 503), it is difficult to govern because of the problems created by the distribution and return of the products to be evaluated.

Moreover, Anvur failed to ensure the anonymity of the authors of the products to be examined; this requirement – as is known- is essential for peer review that aims to be neutral. The immediate identifiability of the authors and their reputation, as well as the easy identification of the universities to which they belong, influenced, for better or for worse, the assessment on the individual products.

To all this, one must add the fact that Gev 14 renounced to raising the level of responsibility of the reviewers, who were mostly recruited with two short email lines. It lacked, as a consequence, an appropriate responsibility of reviewers which would have been even more necessary to solicit when it became obvious that the gap between the insignificant remuneration provided by Miur for each assessment and the considerable commitment arising from the evaluations would have discouraged many people from accepting the job or would have oriented them towards doing it ‘at ease’. Within the community of political analysts the refusal was 36% for the Italian reviewers and 47.7% for the foreigners. It indicates that in many cases the allocation was probably addressed to the wrong people. The errors of attribution would have been more limited if a systematic cross examination between the reviewer’s curricula and the content of the works assigned to them had been carried out. But the Gev 14 report suggests that in many cases it was not possible to comply with this

procedure because the group of evaluators was overwhelmed by the large amount of works that were returned by reviewers on the grounds of not having enough time to carry out the task assigned to them (55.5% Italians, 37% foreigners).

In other words, the high amount of articles and books sent back to Gev 14 by irresponsible reviewers, coupled with the need to close the entire work of evaluation as scheduled, led in many cases to the allocation in emergency conditions of the products to be evaluated. This certainly has not helped the effective targeting of the products that in the end was focused on a more limited number of reviewers compared to those who at the beginning had offered their availability.

The narrowing of the actual number of reviewers contributed in many cases to the assignment of a number of revisions per person significantly higher than those initially distributed. As a result of this changed plan, 33.5% of Italian reviewers examined from 21 to more than 25 products each (p. 29), and time “in the final phase of the evaluation, had become very restricted” (p. 27). Without underestimating the important work that our colleagues have played, however, it is reasonable to doubt that even the more responsible reviewers have always been able to examine so many products in depth and arrive at a balanced judgment on each of them. These working conditions contributed, according to Gev 14, to “generate considerable variability in judgment on the products themselves” (p. 64) and made often necessary the intervention of the consensus group (see above) to reach the formulation of a coherent final judgment.

These remarks do not claim to offer a shared judgment on the quality of the results of the Gev 14, and even less on the work of all the Gevs. I, merely, intend to point out the shortcomings of a commitment that shows, in many other respects, relevant merits, as for the first time a massive, systematic and transparent process for assessing the quality of scientific research in our country was launched. On the other hand, the Gev 14 final report reveals several weaknesses that suggest the need to discuss an experience which has, in my opinion, a still experimental character.

The aggregated results need also to be evaluated with caution because the final rankings in the appendices which show at the top the university structures with the most brilliant performance appears biased by the fact that the statistical distribution of the data tends to favor the smaller structures against the largest ones, with the consequence of distorting the results of any list designed to identify and report the best scholars.

Book Review: La città nella scienza politica americana

By Maria Tullia Galanti, 15/11/2013

Francesca Gelli, *La città nella scienza politica americana* (Soveria Mannelli, Italy: Rubbettino, 2012). 162 pp., €14 (paper) ISBN: 9788849836325.

What does the city tell to political scientists? With this reasoned review of sociological and political studies on American cities from the 50s on, the book by Francesca Gelli introduces a discussion on the relevance of urban studies and local politics to US academic debate. In the view of the author, these studies go beyond power and élites by focusing on their contribution to methodology and to empirical theories of democracy. Moreover, by the end of the book, the Author gives an up-to-date perspective on metropolitan areas and on the participative and deliberative practices in the context of American federalism with a presentation of the directions of urban policies of the US government.

The unconventional interpretation of these studies, often masterpieces of political science and sociology, represents the pros of the book. In the first chapter, the classic study on New Haven in 1961 is presented with reference to its methodological distinction and to Robert Dahl's polemic vein towards the very first theorists of the pluralist approach and the weak empirical control hypothesis (p. 21). Similarly, following the argumentation of Bachrach and Baratz (1970) and Rae (2003), the Author introduces the issue of the ideological and conflicting facet of 'non decisions' in urban policies along with the fading of local political representatives as dominant actors in the complex economic and social texture of the American city. In the second chapter, the author cites the cases of political appointments in New York and of the conflicts in Oberlin and Chicago to show how new concepts and analytical categories were created in reality. Lowi, Wildavsky and Banskfield developed the idea of the "arens of policy" and the vision of the urban political system as a never-ending process of distribution of power according to a "mix of decisions (and decision makers) about social issues" (p. 86). In chapter 3, different views about the usefulness and rigour of case studies as a methodological choice are proposed. The Author reconstructs the different evaluations of the scientific value of case studies and connects them to different epistemological views (p. 93) by elaborating generalizations on power dynamics vs reconstructing narratives to account for policy change.

Towards the end of the 70s, the American city becomes the scene of harsh political confrontation. On one side, the analysis of the implementation at the local level of federal programs shows the limitations of paradigms inspired to planning and efficiency (p.99). At the same time, the development of different forms of participation is investigated, from contestation to collaboration between political institutions and civil society (pp. 121-127). On the other side, politics in cities spreads from the access to power provided by self-government and by the contrasts among different levels of government (p. 141). The author recalls here Elazar's theory of American federalism, the checks and balances of a fragmented political power that is at the same time an opportunity and a constraint for effectiveness in metropolitan areas (p. 131-132).

In this discussion, the author introduces issues typical of the European debate, such as local governance and its complexity. Leadership of mayors in American cities becomes than the fundamental activity to solve implementation problems while building power coalitions (p. 151). Leadership is though the mechanism for the promotion of innovation also due to the "ability to listen" and to mediate in the relationship with different levels of governments (p. 111).

The book closes up with an evaluation on what the studies on the American city means to the Italian political science as an academic discipline. According to the author, Italian political scientists would have read the American city in order to inspire traditional comparative studies on political parties and machine politics, leaving aside other issues such as the relationship between urban policy and political culture (p. 152). In the author's opinion, the debate among scholars, institutions and political representative on urban policies is still lacking, thus opening up to the development of a new research agenda of the city as the *locus* of politics, where conflict, leadership, participation, responsiveness and social equality are intertwined and the quality of democracy is expressed.

Maria Tullia Galanti, *Università degli Studi di Firenze*

Book Review: Winds of Democratic Change in the Mediterranean?

By Elena Baracani, 15/11/2013

Stefania Panebianco, Rosa Rossi (eds.), Winds of Democratic Change in the Mediterranean? Processes, Actors and Possible Outcomes (Soveria Mannelli, Italy: Rubbettino, 2012). 381 pp., ISBN: 9788849831832.

The so called Arab Spring started in January 2011 in Tunisia where initial street demonstrations for better living conditions escalated into clashes with the authorities and convinced president Ben Ali to flee to Saudi Arabia. These events had an immediate contagious effect, favored by the globalization of communication, and popular uprisings emerged also in Egypt, Jordan, Algeria, Yemen, Bahrain, Morocco and Syria. All this created great expectations by analysts that the Arab Spring could represent a starting point for a new wave of democratization involving Middle East and Northern African (MENA) countries, and therefore that it could challenge the assumption of Arab exceptionalism with regard to democracy.

This volume, edited by Stefania Panebianco and Rosa Rossi, investigates this complex phenomenon and addresses crucial questions such as the causes of popular requests, how to democratize the Arab world, and whether the international community can promote democracy in this area. Interestingly the approach of the book is multidisciplinary and analytical: historical, philosophical and political science approaches have been used to analyze three key dynamics, the process of political and social change, domestic and external actors promoting or preventing change, and the possible outcomes. As illustrated in the introduction, the metaphor of winds of democratic change – used also in the title – suggests that there is not only one unique and straightforward path of political change, and that it can be the result of different combinations of historical, political, economic, and social factors.

This book was the result of the Jean Monnet Information and Research Activity on 'EU Foreign Policy and Democracy Promotion' (EUEM project) of which Stefania Panebianco and Rosa Rossi were, respectively, Academic Director and Tutor. The volume consists of 16 thematic chapters divided into three parts on processes (Part 1), actors (Part 2) and possible outcomes (Part 3), in addition to an introduction and a conclusion. Part 1 includes different theoretical and empirical issues in order to better understand the prospects of regime change in the MENA area. In this part, key domestic variables – such as historical legacies (chapter 1 by Davide Grassi), economic development (chapter 2 by Roberto Roccu, with a specific focus on Egypt), civil society organizations (chapter 5 by Rosa Rossi), and religion (chapter 6 by Luca Ozzano with a specific focus on Turkey) – are examined in order to evaluate the prospects of democratization for this area. This part also contains an in depth analysis of the notion of equality of opportunity, which is considered as a fundamental element of democracy (chapter 3 by Ian Carter), and of the notion of tolerance without values, with reference to exchanges between citizens coming from different cultural backgrounds (see chapter 4 by Fabrizio Sciacca). The second part of the book deals with key external and domestic actors in promoting political change. Specific actors considered are the European Union (chapter 7 by Stefania Panebianco), parliamentary bodies, sub-state regions and cities (chapter 8 by Stelio Stavridis, Roderick Pace and Paqui Santonja), the United States (chapter 9 by Maria Do Ceu Pinto), the web and new media (chapter 10 by Daniela Melfa and Guido Nicolosi), and religious movements like the Muslim Brothers (chapter 11 by Laura Guazzone with a specific focus on Egypt). The last part of the book, which is based on the general assumption that it is too early to establish whether the area is experiencing a truly democratic

transition or simply political change, evaluates the possible future outcomes of the Arab Spring. This is done in different ways: drawing lessons from the past, focusing on different issues and factors, as the role of war in creating new political systems (chapter 12 by Biagio Spoto), the colonial legacy and business relations (chapter 15 by Federico Cresti on Italy-Libya relations), and religious issues (chapter 16 by Alessia Melcangi on the Coptic minority in the case of Egypt); and finally looking at the possible transition of specific case studies, as Lebanon (chapter 13 by Rosita Di Peri), and Tunisia (chapter 14 by Béatrice Hibou).

In the conclusion, Stefania Panebianco resumes the main findings of the volume. First of all, it is argued that the popular claim for freedom, justice and equity clearly (and violently) expressed during the Arab Spring seems to be enough to put into question the assumption of the Arab exceptionalism with regard to democracy. Moreover, it seems that Arab protesters have de facto agreed upon a shared definition of democracy, which is both procedural and participatory, and thus based on political rights and individual liberties. Second, the book confirms that political regime change should be conceptualized as a primarily domestic driven process, in which domestic agents and structures take the lead in explaining this dynamic. It was only when the authoritarian regimes, in Tunisia, Egypt and Libya, lost their internal legitimacy, as demonstrated by the widespread popular uprisings, that the long-standing authoritarian leaders were defeated. This loss of internal legitimacy can be explained with the incapacity or unwillingness of the incumbents to deal with new structural internal conditions characterized by the rising costs of living, unemployment, poverty, and corruption. The contributions show that four different kinds of internal actors took and will take the lead in determining this process of domestic change: Islamist parties, the army, the new media, and newly established civil society organizations.

On the whole this book presents an all-encompassing and well-thought evaluation of the Arab Spring and suggests different approaches and directions that should be further investigated by students of Comparative and International Politics interested in the process of political change in the MENA countries.

Elena Baracani *is assistant professor of Political Science at the University of Bologna.*

Book Review: European Integration and Transformation in the Western Balkans

By Cristina Dallara, 15/11/2013

Arolda Elbasani (eds.), *European Integration and Transformation in the Western Balkans. Europeanization or Business as Usual?* (New York, USA: Routledge, Routledge/UACES Contemporary European Studies Series, 2013). 218 pp., £85.00 (cloth), ISBN: 9780415594523.

The book edited by Arolda Elbasani focuses on the Europeanization of the Western Balkans offering a broad and deep reflection of the EU transformative power in this geo-political area. As Elbasani explains, when the EU expanded its concept of enlargement also to the Western Balkans, it generated high expectations that the enlargement strategy would work in the same way as it had in the Central and Eastern Europe (CEE). In 1999, the EU launched a specific process for the region, the 'Stabilization and Association Process' (SAP), largely based on the same mechanisms, values and tools of the CEE Enlargement, but including also some additional more-targeted criteria (regional cooperation among the Western Balkan states and cooperation with the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia). In this respect, the chapter of Phinnemore, in the Elbasanis' book, offers a detailed analysis of the similarities and close links between the SAP and the CEE Enlargement strategy.

Thus, Europeanization and Enlargement conditionality became the dominant approaches also to study EU-led reform in the Western Balkans region. However, the first results provided evidence that these countries shared poor records of reforms and the widespread presence of unfavorable domestic conditions that challenged the EU's transformative power. In spite of these results, still very little research on whether and how challenging domestic factors may undermine EU transformative power is available.

The aim of the book is, in fact, to conceptualize and assess the weight of the domestic conditions – in different reform areas and countries – that might inhibit Europeanization or account for delay. In those countries, unlike the CEE, public support for EU norms and values and for EU membership was more fragile. According to the author, resistance to, and occasional rejection of, the EU conditions in the Western Balkans was due to the perceived non-legitimacy of the EU's demands.

In this respect the book aims to ascertain the explanatory factors accounting for different domestic responses to Europeanization. To this end, the volume proceeds to unpacking domestic context and challenging factors along with three main lines: 1) *Strengths of reformist elites*, meaning the presence of EU coalition with domestic actors. Here the focus is on the reformist constellations that tend to ally with the EU favouring compliance with the EU requirements. 2) *Hindering historical legacies and inhibiting structures*, conceived as formal and informal conditions that frame (or limit) actors' agency and capacity of action to take or to execute new rules and models. 3) *Weak stateness*, with a double meaning of contested state authority related to sovereignty issues and lack of infrastructural capacity to exercise state authority. Infrastructural weakness can derive from contested authority but might feature also in consolidate nation states.

The focus on *weak stateness* is, although challenging, the most interesting and distinguishing aspect of the book, in respect to other studies on Western Balkans. The chapter of Börzel, in particular, underlines that the majority of the Western Balkans countries, with some exception of Croatia, are characterized by 'limited stateness', meaning the lack of adequate capacity to make and enforce collectively binding rules that can also partially affect sovereignty and territorial issues. In countries where borders are still contested and ethnic identities still clash, also the adoption of policies not directly linked with statehood issues is perceived as extremely costly or as intrusions into national sovereignty matters. Problems related to state sovereignty and statehood-linked issues have influenced the capacity, or better the willingness, of domestic actors to accomplish the EU-driven reforms. For this reason, in many cases rule adoption has been 'selective', or rather

implemented only in relation to those priorities that did not imply an 'intrusion' into national sovereignty, and they have often taken the form of fake compliance, with reforms being simply on paper without internalization and concrete institutional changes.

The book has a twofold added value. Firstly, it brings-back the attention of the European political science community on the Western Balkans region. Since it lost its reputation of "trouble-making periphery" of Europe experiencing slow normalization (p. 3), it lost also the attention of the public opinion and of the political scientists too that, instead, converged massively on a new turbulent region of interest, the one of the Arab Springs. Secondly, the book "brings domestic factors back in" (p. 5) trying to better contextualise the links between legacies of the past and stateness problems and properties, that is surely the key point to understand the different trajectories of democratization and Europeanization in the Western Balkans.

Overall the structure of the book is convincing although some chapters, as in the majority of the edited volumes, are less insightful than others. In particular, if the analysis of the three groups of domestic factors and of their impact on Europeanization is clear in the country case-study chapters, it is less persuasive in the chapters focusing on cross-countries reforms areas.

Cristina Dallara *is faculty member at the National Research Council of Italy – Research Institute on Judicial Systems (CNR-IRSIG).*