



Munich Personal RePEc Archive

# **Analytical and Methodological Framework of Research in European and/or EU Studies Curriculum**

Buda, Mariana and Horga, Ioan

University of Oradea

2012

Online at <https://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/63038/>  
MPRA Paper No. 63038, posted 23 Mar 2015 15:09 UTC

## **Analytical and Methodological Framework of Research in European and/or EU Studies Curriculum**

*Ioan HORGA & Mariana BUDA, University of Oradea*

**Key words:** Development of European Studies, Core Curriculum in EU Studies, subfields of EU Studies, European universities, Research Methodology

**Abstract:** *The aim of this part is to provide a thorough view of the methodological and analytical framework of our study concerning the most important aspects of current developments within the EU Studies curricula. Lately, while speaking about Core Curriculum in European Studies, one can find various names: EU Studies, European Integration Studies or simply, European Studies. So, starting off from previous findings of other research conducted within the field (EpsNet, TEPSA, UACES, Tuning, Enseigner l'Europe), we tried to harmonize the actual debate of Curriculum in European Studies.*

*The Methodology of our research consisted in collecting information about courses of European Studies from 12 EU Member States: BE, DK, FR, GE, IT, PT, SP, UK, LT, PL, RO, SK at the three level degrees: BA, MA and PhD. Then, we proceeded to identify the domains for each course, by placing them in the 9 fields agreed by the European Commission: EU Political and Administrative Studies, EU Legal Studies, EU Historical Studies, EU Economic Studies, EU International Relations and Diplomacy Studies, EU Intercultural Dialogue Studies, EU Communication and Information Studies, EU and Comparative Regionalism Studies, EU Interdisciplinary Studies. Subdomains were established for each domain. We arranged the courses first in compliance with the found categories and then upon the specializations where they are taught. This allowed us to notice that, unlike the previous approaches which regarded European Studies as both a Multidisciplinarity, and also as an Interdisciplinary discipline, we can perceive the European Studies also as a Disciplinary approach, i.e. as a subdomain of either a traditional domain, or of a new one (e.g. Political Studies; Law; History; Economy; Sociology; International Relations; Communication; Regional Studies).*

European Studies, which are taught in most European Universities nowadays, at Bachelor, Master or doctoral-level programmes, have become a natural component of curricula in university studies. They introduce the European dimension in university studies and in time have contributed to the continuous European integration of European countries into the European Community and later on into the European Union. European Studies are centred on the analysis of national and transnational changes on the European continent as a unity, emphasising the European integration as the core of curricula (Gonzalez and Wagenaar 2005: 19). Taking into consideration that defining this area of study is connected to events that take place nowadays, the curricula are continuously developing, e.g. the terrorist attacks (in Madrid, 2004 and London, 2005) and the answers given by the European institutions to the stirring debates on foreign policies, migration, human freedom, or intercultural relations. The rejection of the proposed EU constitution in referenda in France and the Netherlands in 2005 rekindled the debates on the essence of European Union and European identity. Such important events have found correspondents within the university curricula. The European Studies are both multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary, at the same time. There is variety of diplomas, and their areas of applicability are Law, Economics, Politics, International Relations, History, Sociology and

Business Management. Differences were found in the structure of the European Studies, their contents and their approach towards teaching and learning depending on both traditions, and on the universities or departments that develop these studies.

### **1. Current aspects of curricula development in European Studies**

To get involved in developing curricula for European Studies means to enter an area where the debate on the notion of European Studies is vivid, due to the ambiguity between European Studies and European Integration Studies and EU Studies. For example, Michael Smith said that EU Studies (Smith M 2003: 3) is the core of European Studies. Also, Chris Rumford and Philomena Murray assert that EU Studies have long been European Integration (EI) studies (Rumford and Murray 2003: 86). The assumption that integration is central to EU studies has been institutionalized in the often repeated conflicts between neo-functionalists and the intergouvernementalists. If European Integration Studies refers to the analysis of phenomena connected to the common market and other linked phenomena, EU Studies should be seen as more than just a market analysis. It embodies a “social model” (Rumford and Murray 2003: 88). EU may be “a moral framework for globalisation, anchored in solidarity and sustainable development (European Council in Lacken 2001).” The topic of government is more and more present within the European Studies, especially since the debate on multilevel government has grown (Hooghe and Marks 2001). The multilevel governance model allowed the separation of EU Studies from European Integration Studies (Murray 2000) as EU Studies allows the development of other approaches - EU regional policy studies; studies of the relationship between globalisation and EU area.

We believe that the notion of European Studies, in spite of the existing ambiguity and potential criticism, expresses in the best possible way, the whole of this field, from the perspective of its institutional and curricular evolution, to the perspective of its various national experience, which covers not only the founding countries of the European Union, but also the East and Central Europe countries that have since joined the European Union. Even though European Studies (Manners 2003) have had a slow dynamics until 1989<sup>1</sup>, the real development took place after 1995-1996, when European Studies became a part of Eastern and Central countries. A huge explosion is seen after 2000, when countries in the process of joining the EU became more active, when thoughts on European Agenda are expressed more variously and questions on the new university approach are asked. We have conducted a survey through which we are trying to establish the status of European Studies at the present time. To make our research more clear, we have conducted a study case in which we have gathered data from universities from twelve European Union countries. As main sources of the study we have used official websites of these universities, building a database containing information on all European Studies courses we found.

For our survey we gathered information on courses about European Studies from twelve European countries: Slovakia, Lithuania, Poland, Spain, Italy, Portugal, Great Britain, Belgium,

---

<sup>1</sup> European Community Studies Association (ECSA) has issued a comprehensive report titled “Place de l’integration europeenne dans les programmes universitaires. Rapports nationaux” resented at Bruxelles in June 29-30, 1989 within the ECSA-Europe Conference on the status of courses with European vocation, at the level of each Member State of the European Community, or as the name says, on the place of European integration within university curricula.

Germany, France and Denmark. Although these countries were chosen randomly out of the twenty-seven countries that belong to the European Union, we have focused on two aspects: these countries represent approximately half of the members of the European Union and cover all European regions (to the East: Poland, Romania, Slovakia; to the North: Denmark, Lithuania, Great Britain; to the South: Italy, Portugal, Spain; and to the West: Belgium, France and Germany). Moreover, for the majority of countries, the data was collected by specialist from these particular countries, i.e. we made use of the human contacts that we have.

The reviewed courses belong to the academic year 2008/2009, summing up to almost 10,000 courses on European Studies on the three level programmes. But the number and contents of questions on European Studies evolution did not keep up with the rapid expansion of Europe.

The crossing between the object of European Studies/European Integration Studies/EU Studies, the knowledge of this object and the extension of academic courses is in a continuous interaction, with different nuances from one subfield to another, and from one country to another. EU Studies is a very rich field where the dynamics of this interaction can be seen (Schmidt 2002; Wessels 2006). The interaction object / production/ teaching of European Studies is very active in the UK both institutionally, through the University Association for Contemporary European Studies (UACES) (Jones 2000) and Standing Conference of Heads of European Studies (SCHES) (Smith M. 2003), and individually (Church 1993; Flood 1997; Bruzzone 2000; Smith M. 2003), advancing quickly after 1993. What is worth mentioning is the fact that in North America, Australia and New Zealand there is an interesting theory on European Studies which came into being during the last decade (Makins 1998; Pavkovic and Welch 1999; Field 2001; Bukowski 1997; Hagele 2000). In Eastern and Central Europe thoughts on developing European Studies can be found starting on 1997, even though the field is still new. In 1997, in Cluj-Napoca (Romania) the *European Studies Today Conference* houses a debate on the multidisciplinary of the field, thus allowing the description, explanation and understanding of the European reality, which would be impossible within one single subject (Marga 1997: 13).

Starting on 2000, while the European Union has been expanding towards East, thoughts on European Studies evolution get obvious dynamics. Now we can speak about new studies on measuring the evolution and the drawing of a common agenda within the contents of European Studies, strictly connected to the Bologna directives. We can mention *Erasmus Thematic Network in Political Sciences (EPSNet)* and its thoughts on the topic<sup>2</sup> and the Tuning project, especially its second stage after 2003 (Gonzalez and Wagenaar 2005: 93-98).

Second, there are studies meant to highlight the need for flexibility, which contradicts the idea of being limited. Our arguments are based on the requirement that the European Studies programme has a contemporary focus based on an engagement with aspects of the current processes of European integration; the requirement of foreign language teaching that is closely applied to other elements of the programme; a multidisciplinary approach to the subjects covered (Smith M.L. 2003: 24). Only flexible curricula, without limitations, can be beneficial to students at educational specializations, students who are future teachers and who can help young people understand the notion of multiple identities: European, national, local.

---

<sup>2</sup> European Thematic Network in Political Science (EPSnet) developed by the Institut d'Etudes Politiques de Paris, and the Jean Monnet Chair in Political Sciences at the Universite de Cologne within 2000-2004 and the Trans European Policy Studies Association (TEPSA), [www.unikoeln.de/wiso-fak/powi/wessels/Core-Curriculum/index.htm](http://www.unikoeln.de/wiso-fak/powi/wessels/Core-Curriculum/index.htm)

To conclude, we have in mind studies that bring challenges which European Studies (Clegg 2002; Smith M.L. 2003) have to face, conditions in which they are taught (Smith, Belot and Georgakakis 2004; Cini and Bourne 2006), the social sciences of EU Studies (Warleigh 2004; Rosamond 2007). Even in countries preparing to join the European Union – that is the Baltics (Muravska 2005), Poland (Rudniki 2009), Romania (Craciun 2003) – there are studies meant to help adjust university studies to the Bologna project.

The real European dimension needs following of values which require developing skills and competence specific to the European education, necessary for developing a European Conscience: cooperation, interaction, interdisciplinarity, anticipation, innovation etc. Actually, the European dimension of education represents the result of surpassing national boundaries, of particularities that came into being in certain regions, with time based on traditions; it also means to have a clear idea of what is common to different social, cultural and religious entities.

Since teenagers are familiarised with the ideas of Europe, European unity, integration, we need to know if they are aware of the countries that truly belong to the big family and moreover, if they are ready to live and work within a united Europe. Thus every specialization should adopt a real “*education a l’Europe*” (Massit-Follea and Epinette 1992: 135), as teaching (both as an act, and as a profession) requires this. The new millennium brings changes in education, especially in universities. The changes are numerous, approaches, too. A first step would be the introduction of Bologna project, a major university reform. Then, the theory of European Studies: there are more and more articles and research on European Studies, which show a differentiation within European Studies. They are no longer called European Studies, but European integration studies, European unity studies, or European Union studies. Many authors speak about including European Studies in a major field: Political Studies, Social Studies or Humanities. This is justified if we consider their diversity, since European Studies are practically multidisciplinary studies.

## **2. European Studies/ EU Studies between “Towards a Core Curriculum in EU Studies” and “Do We Need a Core Curriculum in European Studies?”**

Having analyzed the scientific developments within this field, we came to the conclusion that the debate on European Studies curricula is set between two theoretical limitations (Umbach and Scholl 2003; Rumford and Murray P 2003). On the one hand, there is a trend that shows the existence of intellectual and resource waste in teaching European Studies, with two complementary facets:

a) The idea of curricula. The evolution of European Union seen from the perspective of its expansion, on the one hand, associated with the expansion of teaching Europe, require an academic environment preoccupied with European studies of a core curriculum, understood as a list of essential items for European Studies; a list of objectives, of topics and teaching methods. Setting a core curriculum does not mean “to monopolise one approach or school of thought, but to present a pluralist list and reflect about competing explanations” (Wessels, Linsenmann and Hagele 2001:4). Similar approaches are found also within the candidate countries. The *Inter-Faculty Center of European Studies at the Jagellonian University* in Krakaw and the European University Institute in Florence have developed a project titled *European Studies Curriculum Development for Central and Eastern Europe*, project that undertakes the development of a European Studies curriculum in Poland. (Rudniki 2009: 7). Setting a core curriculum is necessary in order to offer university support to prepare students for job opportunities at the

international, European, national and/or regional level. There are many common aspects which could translate themselves into a core curriculum: the institutions and the procedures of EU, polity, policies, etc. According to these, a core curriculum does not cancel the variety of offered courses, but give numerous and various experiences.

b) The idea of a teaching companion. The teaching companion of the European Studies was the second stage of EpsNet/EPISTEME II (Umbach 2003). Such teaching companion shall promote European cooperation in quality control, in developing a European dimension within universities and provide most fundamental information about EU. At the same time, it shall offer “a guide to European Integration that can serve for the conceptualisation of university courses in different educational systems.” (Umbach 2003:7). Also the teaching companion shall support the teaching within the EU, not by means of harmonisation, but by establishing common frameworks, in which the content can be transferred across national and disciplinary borders.

In opposition with the supporters of the core curriculum, we have found those who believe that a core curriculum is against the university spirit. This does not reflect only the interests and expertise of an individual within a limited number of individuals, but through its diversity it invites to a debate. First, it is considered that the core curriculum is a risk of “setting up core leaders of the discipline with followers who apply and teach their thoughts” (Rumford and Murray 2003). It has limitations on academic imagination. There is no need for common curricula, but for a diversity framework for debate, a theory and new approaches to European evolution. If at the Bachelor-level programme there may be a common curriculum at European level, at the Masters-level programme such common curriculum is almost impossible, taking into consideration the variety of opportunities and challenges that these studies require (Wisniewska 1998; Andreycheva 1998).

Secondly, it may be said that a core curriculum can be drawn for European Integrations Studies, which represents the central cleavage of European Studies, in general. But to cover the variety of thoughts on European evolution in its ambivalence of open/closed (Delanty 2006; Banus 2007), hard to soft (Maron 2007), from communitarian to national, from exclusive to inclusive (Horga and Pantea 2007), from monocultural to multicultural (Marga 1998), only the open, but not free curricula can answer to the phenomenon of multilevel Europeanization.

Even initiators of core curriculum in EU Studies mention that diversity must remain as an important factor of diversification and specialization in EU Studies, as it emphasizes the open character of curricular development in European Studies.

Developing curricula in European Studies should surpass the strictly academic framework, should face challenges in the continuous dynamics of European construction. Starting with the questions asked by European Thematic Network in Political Science (EPSnet), developed by the Institut d'Etudes Politiques de Paris, and the Jean Monnet Chair in Political Science at the University of Cologne and the Trans European Policy Studies Association (TEPSA), regarding the demands for a core curriculum, within our research we have tried to see if, in almost 10 years since this project has been initiated, there is a dynamics in the direction suggested by the EPSnet initiators or there is a multidimensional curriculum. Thus we have tried to see if European Studies stay set in traditional courses on comparative political government and in courses on international affairs (Remacle 2000) or “remains highly disjointed, seated in various disciplines and educational schemes” (Umbach and Scholl 2003).

The object of our research was the courses on Europe taught at the three level programmes - Bachelor's, Master's and PhD - during 2008/2009 academic year, in universities from twelve EU Member States (Belgium, Denmark, France, Spain, Germany, Italy, Lithuania,

Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia and United Kingdom). Two independent studies on developing European Studies in Baltic countries and Turkey were added to our research.

### **3. Research methodology**

This research was born, on the one hand, from the desire to identify all courses that discuss the European dimension at the level of European universities, attempting to address the queries of students pursuing training in European Studies and on the other hand, in order to make an inventory of universities and their specializations that transmit the idea of European unity.

This research is not complete. It is merely the reflection of a *status quo* of an existing reality, an inventory of current resources and it is a tool capable to reflect a new approach and a dynamics towards the needs of European university teaching. Specialists collected data complying with a set of requirements, which included: the name of the university in its native language, its name translated into English, the specialization or the study programme, the title of the course, the field to which the course belongs, the type of course (core, elective or free), number of hours and number of credits. It is possible that during our data gathering some courses might have been omitted, having in view that we generally used online research, which may not have allowed other courses to be discovered, thus affecting the rigour of this research. But all these possible omissions cannot be of such great importance as to question our gathered information. Taking upon us these mishaps, normal to such work, we shall try to present the specifics of EU Studies curriculum in universities of the above-mentioned twelve countries. Our work has covered the selection of information in two stages.

#### **3.1. Selecting courses referring to EU Studies**

Using EU Studies framework given by the European commission through Jean Monnet Action, we have included every course into one of the nine existing fields: EU Legal Studies, EU Political and Administrative Studies, EU Economic Studies, EU Historical Studies, EU Interdisciplinary Studies, EU Intercultural Dialogue Studies, EU Communication and Information Studies, EU and Comparative Regionalism Studies, EU International Relations and Diplomacy Studies<sup>3</sup>.

This was difficult due to at least two points of view, which may raise some questions on our research. First, the title of the course is not always as relevant as to be mentioned in the EU Studies curricula. In view of the aforementioned, many discussions may be stirred up by EU Historical Studies, EU Interdisciplinary Studies, and EU Intercultural Dialogue Studies. Assuming the responsibility of choosing courses referring to European History or European Cultural History and including the category of EU Historical Studies, we wanted to view the EU Studies curricula from a wider perspective, in which courses on old, medieval or modern history, or part of courses offered to human science students (history, cultural studies, pedagogical studies, European Studies etc.) offer a solid basis for European unity. We kept the same view on general courses on European Cultural History offered to students of technical or non-humanities specializations<sup>4</sup>.

In the case of EU Interdisciplinary Studies, the situation is even more open to interpretations since it generically includes, on the one hand, courses whose titles are somewhere

---

<sup>3</sup> <http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/llp/jeanmonnet/directory/New/Version/2008/V1/ajmrepertoire/distrib.Asp>

<sup>4</sup> Technische Universität Hamburg-Harburg; Universität Paderborn; Universität Postdam

between general EU Studies and other studies (sociology, linguistics, geography, theology etc.). In this case, too, we opted for a wider perspective when given the opportunity to link the title to the specializations of students who benefitted from them. On the other hand, we included in this category courses that can be considered to be part of EU Studies although their titles make one look for an adjacent field (i.e. EU Political Studies and Administrative Studies and EU and Comparative Regionalism Studies, or EU International Relations and Diplomacy Studies; EU Historical Studies and EU Intercultural Dialogue Studies, or EU Communication and Information Studies etc.). We included these courses in the second stage of EU Interdisciplinary Studies research, in subfields such as Social Studies, Education Studies, Multilingualism, Religious Studies, Regional Studies, etc.

If the first two aforementioned fields (Historical Studies and EU Interdisciplinary Studies) have a certain tradition in European practice, taking into account that they belong, next to EU Political Studies and Administrative Studies, EU Legal Studies and EU Economic Studies, to the five fields set by Jean Monnet structures (models, permanent courses, chairs) the EU Intercultural Dialogue Studies field has more recently been promoted, i.e. sometime after 2007. This is why we are set on a shaken ground, on the one hand because of the lack of explicit courses on this subject, on the other hand, because of the researcher's desire to include this field in his/her research. This is why we decided to include in this category only two types of courses (those referring to extra European civilisations – the Islam and those referring to Europe's cultural diversity). We favoured titles that included the idea of European civilisation (European religious phenomenon and multilingualism), related to our research and qualifying to be included in EU Interdisciplinary Studies.

Actually, our limiting towards more recent research in EU Studies (EU Intercultural Dialogue Studies, EU Communication and Information Studies, EU and Comparative Regionalism Studies, EU International Relations and Diplomacy Studies) was our choice for which we bear responsibility. On the one hand, as they are so new, there are not so many examples of good practice or contents either institutionally (if we consider Jean Monnet Directive in diversifying fields) or from the didactics point of view. On the other hand, we do not have enough elements to analyse or to include this type of course into a certain category (having only titles of courses does not allow us to grasp the contents).

Second, the titles are often border line between two or more fields. Only in the case of EU Legal Studies things are clearer, having the word “legal” or “right” associated with “European”, “EU” or “communitarian”, preventing us from including the courses in other fields.

Once we looked onto each field we found that some could be more represented, like EU Political and Administrative Studies, EU Interdisciplinary Studies or EU Historical Studies, either by including some courses that do not belong to EU Studies, or by including courses which, after accessing the studying schedule, could facilitate the classification into a more adequate course contents category. We found other fields like EU Economic Studies, EU Intercultural Dialogue Studies, EU Communication and Information Studies, EU and Comparative Regionalism Studies, EU International Relations and Diplomacy Studies to be underrepresented because courses belonging to this category – based on the title – were included in more represented fields (EU Intercultural Dialogue Studies *versus* EU Communication and Information Studies; EU and Comparative Regionalism Studies *versus* EU International Relations and Diplomacy Studies).

Within EU Political and Administrative Studies we might have found the biggest ambiguity with reference to whether a course should be housed here or not, considering that it



could be found in almost all other fields (except for EU Legal Studies, partially EU Historical Studies and partially EU Economic Studies). For instance, a course titled *European Integration*, very often with this title, but also in association with other titles like *Theory and History*, *Governance and Political Economy*, *Identity*, etc., could be fitted either in EU Historical Studies, studying the integration process from a diachronic perspective, or in EU Economic Studies, looking from the perspective of a synchronous unique market. The same, a generic course, *The European Union*, or associated with *History and Institutions* or *Economic Policy*, place us in a situation of choosing without a precise argument.

In conclusion, although the objectivity of our survey seems to be questioned we can state that, if we look at the relevance of some courses in order to be part of EU Studies curricula or at the fact that the titles of some courses are often borderline between two or more fields, we shall take the responsibility for our findings, as a few ambiguities encountered during our research (circa 10-15%) cannot change the validity of general observation and therefore, they cannot alter the synthetic conclusion.

### **3.2. The breakdown of courses on subfields of EU Studies**

For a more complex analysis of the collected data, we made a working template for each EU Studies field, with the following categories: subfield, types/groups of courses, courses titles and university examples. This template was adapted to the content of each field, considering the selected courses. Each field template was realized using as case study the Curriculum for European Studies for BA degree programme in Germany. We used this example because we were to find found, on the one hand most courses of EU studies (1105 titles), and on the other hand, because we find the biggest contents variety that totally covers all 9 fields agreed by European Commission. The template was then adapted for the Master and doctoral studies for each field for the eleven evaluated countries. Proudly we can say that the original template answered 95% of situations during data analysis.

Below you can find a short review of subfields and types of courses that were established for each field of EU Studies. Reviewing courses titles and specializations where EU Legal Studies is taught, we noticed that courses can be grouped in five subfields: *European Law*, *Public European Law*, *Private European Law*, *Economic European Law* and *Social European Law*. Regarding EU Political and Administrative Studies, we created 9 subfields considering the type of courses: *Generalities*, *European Integration*, *European Politics*, *EU as Global Actor*, *Political Analysis of Central and Eastern European Countries*, *European Economic Policy*, *European Social Policy*, *European Education Policy*, *European Foreign and Security Policy*, *Multi-Level-Governance in the EU*. Analysing the courses titles and the specializations where EU Economy Studies are taught, we noticed three subfields: *European Economy*; *European Management*, *Europe and Global Economy*. Analysing the courses titles and the specializations where EU Historical Studies are taught, we divided them into four subfields: *Memory and Europeanization*; *History of European Integration*, *Types of European History*, and *History of Europe*. Being a newer field, we noticed that EU Interdisciplinary Studies contain four subfields: *European Social Studies*, *European Educations Studies*; *European Ethnology*; *Other Studies about Europe*.

For EU Communication and Information Studies the following courses categories were established: *Media Systems*; *Another forms of EU Communication and Information Studies*, and for EU and Comparative Regionalism Studies: *European Regions*; *European Border Regions*.

Analysing courses titles and specializations where EU Intercultural Dialogue Studies is taught, we noticed three categories (with fewer courses). So, the following types were set: *Islam in Europe; Europeanization and cultural diversity; European Dialogue with other geo-cultural spaces*; for EU International Relations and Diplomacy Studies, having fewer courses, we broke them down into two: *The EU in International Relations; International Partners of EU*.

### **3.3. Quantitative analysis of courses about EU Studies (Bachelor, Master, Doctoral)**

The Jean Monnet Programme is an action of the European Union which refers to the education development and academic research in European integration field, to studying of how to build communitarian Europe and his institutional, legal, political, economic and social development. Jean Monnet programme aims to stimulate excellence in higher education, research and the influence concerning studies about European integration in higher education around the world.

According to the information published (The Jean Monnet Action 2008: 3) by European Commission, The Jean Monnet Action includes the following main activities: university projects about European integration, special projects about teaching, research and debates on European integration process, organized by higher studies institution or associations of teacher and researchers specialized in this field. We can say that the Jean Monnet Action was the engine of introduction in university education of courses that approach European integration. Numbers show that this action was accepted in the majority of European universities and increased step by step.

Considering the importance of the Jean Monnet Action in promoting and sustaining the European Studies at European level, we considered relevant for our research the impact that the Jean Monnet Action has in the curricular development within European Studies field.

So, to move on to a more complex analysis of collected data, we put the previously collected data in a table structured by countries, levels of study (Bachelor, Master, PhD) and the 9 established fields of EU Studies.

We collected from the Jean Monnet Action site the teaching structure situation (modules, permanent courses, chairs and centres) for the academic year 2009 for each country included in our research. Unfortunately, we could not access the content of teaching structures, for us to determine which courses belong to Jean Monnet structures. We partially solved this problem by communicating with chair holders of concerned Jean Monnet structures. The data gathered in our investigation were included in our centralizing situation under curricular Jean Monnet units. We tried to compare this information with the one partially published on site, by the Jean Monnet Action for year 2010.

By caring out this comparative analysis, we tried to see the general impact of the Jean Monnet Action over the curricula for European Studies development, for each country included in our survey. In this respect, we wanted to highlight the fact that the more Jean Monnet Action is involved in financing the courses, the more the European Studies curricula is richer, and this was about to be reflected in the number of reviewed courses from our database.

Thus, we established that, when less than 5 curricular units are financed, the impact of the Jean Monnet Action is major, as the number of courses financed by Jean Monnet is huge (like in Italy and Spain); when 5 - 10 units are financed, the impact is optimal (Denmark and Poland). When 15 - 10 curricular units are financed, the impact is medium. Most assessed countries fit in

this category fit. When 20-15 curricular units are financed, the impact is low, and when more than 20 curricular units are financed, the impact is very low.

On the other hand, we wanted to see the impact of the Jean Monnet Action for each application field of European Studies, namely the level of the Jean Monnet Action impact over EU Legal Studies, EU Political and Administrative Studies, EU Economic Studies, EU Historical Studies, EU Interdisciplinary Studies, EU Intercultural Dialogue Studies, EU Communication and Information Studies, EU and Comparative Regionalism Studies, EU International Relations and Diplomacy Studies.

To materialize our step, we used the same curricular units and data collected from the official Jean Monnet website from 2009. Thus, checking the number of courses financed by the Jean Monnet Action for each country and each field, we have observed that the most funds go to the traditional fields, like EU Legal Studies, EU Economic Studies, followed by EU Interdisciplinary Studies, and then, in continuous evolution, EU Intercultural Dialogue Studies, EU Communication and Information Studies, EU and Comparative Regionalism Studies, EU International Relations and Diplomacy Studies.

This comparative analysis should highlight how one of the most important Action which refers to education and academic research development within the European integration field, to the study of building the Communitarian Europe and his institutional, legal, political, economic and social developments, succeed to influence the European Studies curricula in different European Union countries.

#### **4. Internal drivers versus external drivers**

Specialists who have studied the appearance and development of European Studies consider that this phenomenon has taken place in the context of convergent action of two categories of drivers: internal drivers and external drivers. Therefore, in our research we followed the way of action of these drivers in curricular development.

##### **4.1. Internal Drivers**

First, we followed the measure of existence of “a flexible and differentiated curriculum for European Studies”. Unlike the EPSnet project developers, who follow this phenomenon from the teaching of EU Studies point of view to other discipline (Wessels, Linsenmann and Hagele 2001), we developed the analysis from the perspective of studying programmes (specializations) where courses of European Studies are taught, having this way the following point of reflection: European Studies as Disciplinary Framework (Political Science), European Studies as Multidisciplinary Framework (European Studies like area of studies), European Studies as Interdisciplinary Framework. This way, the status of the European Studies curricula seems more visible and we could determine if it is flexible or not, or if it is differentiated or monolithic.

Second, we have followed the way that European Studies curricula help the mobility in various ways for crossing the disciplinary (interdisciplinary) and national (transnational) borders. Once here, after completing de results of EPSnet project, we focused to identify the primary compatibilities between taught disciplines and the degree of their interdisciplinary. Also, we have followed the evolution of ICT application in developing the curriculum for European Studies, from EPSnet/EPISTEME II project interrogation until now, on the one hand as teaching resource, and on the other hand as research resource (Umbach 2003).

## 4.2. External Drivers

First, we followed the way that the European Studies curricula keep up with practical and theoretical evolutions of processes within the European Union. These phenomena researchers were focused on establishing a set of themes within the area of European Studies/ EU Studies/European Integration Studies, themes that, within the academic space, will mirror theoretical debates on European evolutions. All this sets of themes are build “as opposed to national politics, and as opposed to law, economics, history, but as the study of politics, polity and polity of the European Union” (Wessels, Linsenmann and Hagele 2001: 3).

Second, we tried to see the way the development of flexible curricula, differentiated, transnational, transdisciplinary and up to date with the evolution of the European Union receive drivers from European authorities, especially by means of the Jean Monnet Action.

a) We made an evaluation of the impact of projects financed by the Jean Monnet Action (modules, permanent courses, Chairs, centres) over European Studies curricula development from each country.

b) We conducted an evaluation of the impact of projects financed by the Jean Monnet Action (modules, permanent courses, Chairs, centres) over European Studies curricula development for each study field.

Finally, we tried to understand the way the courses from European Studies curricula respond to evolution within the European labour market.

a) First, we tried to see how European Studies courses can provide students with specialized knowledge in a way that can solve problems in a systemic way, to formulate hypotheses and put them to the text, to examine conflicting points of view and to argue their opinion, to bring in new perspectives and solutions (Marga 2009: 167).

b) Second, we focused on the way that European Studies courses can help shaping a culture within development of local, regional, national, European and global community.

c) Third, the way multiple values are promoted – free speech, protection of truth, social responsibility, integrity, equity, creativity through European Studies courses.

d) Finally, we focused on the way European Studies courses help forming a culture of quality, by developing competences and motivation of action; by preparing students to active participation not only in university, but after finishing; by developing the entrepreneurial spirit and leadership; developing de communication skills (Kohler 2009: 206-209), etc.

We can conclude that, in the last years, the European Union has become an increasingly important part of the academic and professional programmes. As an academic issue, the related disciplines have become more relevant in most European universities, particularly in fields like Law, Economy, History or Political Science, even if the approach of these disciplines is still different.

Analyzing the evolution of European Studies from the beginning of this field until now, we can say that they have undergone many changes, both in their shape and in their contents. In the beginning, European Studies had been considered interdisciplinary studies, according to Legal Studies, Economics, Political Science, History, Foreign Languages. Over the time they have greatly evolved from optional courses to university specializations; nowadays they are part, together with other classical disciplines, of the category of standalone educational structures, having its own curricula, its own teaching and learning methods and well stated objectives.

## Bibliography

- Andreytcheva, K. (1998). Teaching European Studies in Bulgaria: the TEMPUS contribution. In D. Grigorescu & N.Paun (Ed.), *European Studies Today* (pp.54-61). Cluj-Napoca: EFES.
- Banus, E. (2007). Images of openness- Images of closeness. *Eurolimes*, 4, 134-141.
- Bruzzone, S. (1999/2000), "A Postgraduate Programme in European Studies –an initiative of the German Federal Foreign Office", in H. Lichtenberg and W. Petzold, *Studying Europe*, Nomos, Baden-Baden, 19-25
- Bukowski, J. (1997). Teaching the EU: Exchanging ideas on techniques and methods, Peoria Illinois. <http://www.eurunion.org/infores/teaching/teacheu.htm> (12.05.2009).
- Church, C. (1993). *European Studies: A Survey of Undergraduate and Postgraduate Provision in UK Higher Education*. London: CNA.
- Cini, M. & Bourne, A. K. (2006). *Palgrave advances in European Union studies*. Palgrave: Macmillan.
- Clegg, N. (2002). Learning from Europe. Lessons in education. Centre for European Reform. Working Paper.
- Crăciun, C. (2003). Nesting Europe: the state of European Studies and research in Romania. *EpsNet Kiosk Plus: The NET Journal of Political Sciences*. 1(2), 29-36.
- Delanty, G. (2006). Borders in a Changing Europe: Dynamics of Openness and Closure. *Eurolimes*, 1, 46-59.
- European Council meeting in Laeken 14-15 December 2001, Presidency conclusions. [http://ec.europa.eu/governance/impact/background/docs/laeken\\_concl\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/governance/impact/background/docs/laeken_concl_en.pdf) (25.06.2009)
- Field, H. (2001). European Integration Curricula and Europeanisation: Alternative Approaches and Critical Appreciation. *Paper presented to the ECSA Seventh Biennial International Conference*, Madison, Wisconsin
- Flood, C. (1997). *European Studies in British Higher Education: a Report to the QAAHE*. Guildford: SCHES
- Gonzalez, J. & Wagenaar, R. (2005). Reference Points for the Design and Delivery of Degrees Programmes in European Studies. In *Tuning. European Studies for website*. Publicaciones de la Universidad de Deusto, Spain. <http://tuning.unideusto.org/tuningeu/cand> (17.08.2009)
- Hagele, S. (2000). Teaching Europe: a core curriculum on European Integration Studies. *ECSA Review*; [http://www.uni-koeln.de/wisofak/powi/wessels/DE/PROJEKTE/CORE\\_CURRICULUM/TEACHING\\_INTEGRATION.PDF](http://www.uni-koeln.de/wisofak/powi/wessels/DE/PROJEKTE/CORE_CURRICULUM/TEACHING_INTEGRATION.PDF) (20.09.2009)
- Hansen, D. & Muravska, T. (2003). European Studies Master Programmes Development in the Baltics. *Congress of European Studies Centres in the Baltic Sea Region* Riga: EuroFaculty.
- Hooghe, L. & Marks, G. (2001). *Multi-level Governance and European Integration*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Horga, I. & Pantea, D. (2007). Europe from Exclusive Borders to Inclusive Frontiers. *Eurolimes*, 4, 5-10.
- Jean Monnet: Projets exemplaires. L'Union Européenne et le monde* (2008).

- Luxembourg: Office des publications officielles des Communautés européennes.
- Jones, S. (Ed.) (2000), *Register of Courses in European Studies. 1998/2000 in UK Universities and University Colleges*, UACES.
- Kohler, J. (2009). Quality in Higher Education. In J. Sadlak, K. Hufner, R. Pricopie & L. Grunberg (Ed), *UNESCO Forum on Higher Education in the Europe Region: Access, Values, Quality and Competitiveness* (pp.107-123), Bucharest
- Lifelong Learning Programme, official site of European Commission. <http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/llp/jeanmonnet/directory/New/Version/2008/V1/JMArepertoire/distrib.asp> (20.10.2009)
- Makins, C. J. (2000), The study of Europe in the United States. Report to the German Marshall Fund of the United States and the delegation of the European Commissions to the United States, Washington DC:
- Manners, I. (2003). European Studies. *Journal of Contemporary Studies*, 11 (1), 67-83
- Marga, A. (1998). European Studies. In D. Grigorescu & N. Paun (Ed.), *European Studies Today*, (pp. 79-101), Cluj-Napoca: EFES.
- Marga, A. (2009). Values of the University. In J. Sadlak, K. Hufner, R. Pricopie & L. Grunberg (Ed.), *UNESCO Forum on Higher Education in the Europe Region: Access, Values, Quality and Competitiveness* (pp.151-174), Bucharest
- Maron, F. (2007). Les nouvelles frontières de l'Europe: repenser les concepts. *Eurolimes*, 4, 112-123
- Massit-Follea, F. & EpINETTE, F. (1992). *L'Europe des Universités. L'enseignement supérieur en mutation*, Paris : Les études de la Documentation française.
- Muravska, T. (2005). *European Studies Development in Latvia: Before and After the Accession*. Kaunas, Lithuania: Technical University, European Institute
- Murray, P. (2000), European Integration Studies: The Search for Synthesis, *Contemporary Politics*, 6(1), 19-28
- Pavkovic. A. & Welch. C. (Ed.) (1999). *Teaching European Studies in Australia: problems and prospects*, CESAA Paper, Australia:Victoria
- Gonzales, J. & Wagennar, R. (2005), *Tuning Educational Structures in Europe II. Universities Contribution to the Bologna Process*, Bilbao: Publications de la Universidad de Deusto.
- Remacle. E. (2000), Teaching European Politics, Politics and Polity in the New Century. Lessons from the experience of Intitute d'Etudes Europeenes, Université Libre de Bruxelles. In K. Sobokta (Ed.), *Political Sciences and EU Related Studies*, (pp.129-141) Lodz
- 20Rumford, C. & Murray, Ph. (2003). Globalization and the Limitation of European Integration Studies: Interdisciplinary Considerations. *Journal of Contemporary European Studies*, 11 (1), 85 -93.
- Rosamond, B. (2007). European integration and the social science of EU studies: the disciplinary politics of a subfield. *International Affairs*, 83 (1), 231-252.
- Rudnicki, Z. B. (2009). The development of European Studies in Poland after 1989 - from specialization to institutionalisation. Paper presented to Jean Monnet Conference 2009 "20 Years of Support for European Integration Studies: From the Jean Monnet Action to the Jean Monnet Programme", Bruxelles
- Schmidt, Brian C. (2002). On the history and historiography of International Relations. In W. Carlsnaes, Th. Risse & B. A., Simmons, *Handbook of international relations*,

- (pp.3-22). London: Sage.
- Smith, A. & Belot, C. & Georgakakis, D. (2004), *Enseigner l'Europe*, Paris: Harmattan;
- Smith, M. (2003), *The State of European Studies. Rapport commissioned by the Standing Conference of Heads of European Studies*, London: SCHES.
- Smith, M. L. (2003). Creating a New Space: UK European Studies Programmes at the Crossroads. *Journal of Contemporary European Studies*, 11(1), 21-34.
- Umbach, G. (2003). Responding to the European Curricula Development: A Teaching Companion in EU Studies, in *Introduction to a new project phase under EpsNet/EPISTEMEII*, [www.uni-koeln.de/wiso-fak/powi/wessels/Core-Curriculum/index.htm](http://www.uni-koeln.de/wiso-fak/powi/wessels/Core-Curriculum/index.htm). (23.11.2009)
- Umbach, G., Scholl, B. (2003). Towards A Core Curriculum EU Studies. *European Political Sciences*, 2(2), p. 71-83.
- Warleigh, A. (2004). In Defence of Intra- disciplinary: “European Studies”, the “New Regionalism” and the Issue of Democratization. *Cambridge Review of International Affairs* 17 (2), 301-317
- Warleigh, A. (2006) 'Learning from Europe? EU studies and the re-thinking of “international relations”', *European Journal of International Relations*, 12 (1), 31–51
- Wisniewska, A. (1998), 'European Studies in Poland' In D. Grigorescu & N. Păun (Ed.), *European Studies Today* (pp.31-32). Cluj-Napoca: EFES.
- Wessels, W., Linsenmann, I., Hagele, S. (2001). Teaching European Integration. A Core Curriculum on European Integration Studies. Basic assumptions and proposals. *Paper presented at the ECSA Seventh Biennial International Conference in Madison, Wisconsin*.
- Wessels, W. (2006). Clivages, controversies and convergence in European Union Studies. In M. Cini & A. K. Bourne (Ed), *Palgrave advances in European Union Studies*, (pp. 107 – 123). Basingstoke: Palgrave Mcmillan