

The Growth of a Profession: Political Science in Denmark 1960-1975

PETER NANNESTAD
University of Aarhus

1. Introduction

When writing about political science as a profession in a political science journal, the idea is easily conceived to make the study of political science the object of a political science study. Many approaches currently applied to political phenomena could possibly serve as valuable tools in solving such a task. For example – to mention only a few possibilities – viewing (maybe erroneously) a degree in political science as a scarce value, we could pose and paraphrase the time-honored question: who gets what, when, and how? But we could as well place the profession within a functionalist framework, concentrating on the functions performed by political science for other systems or society as a whole, or alternatively on the functions necessary to keep political science going as a system of its own. We could emphasize the recruitment aspect, asking who is selected into what elites by means of becoming a member of the political science profession; or we could select the somewhat related socialization aspect, investigating what norms are transmitted and upheld through Danish political science, what roles and attitudes Danish political scientists are socialized into, and how it is done. Applying Mannheim's 'sociology of knowledge' or a full-fledged Marxist approach, we could focus on political science as part of the Danish society's superstructure, attempting to relate the twists and turns in its development to changes in other parts of the superstructure and – eventually – in the material base, the sphere of production, and the tendentially falling rate of profit, and unmasking its role as ideology in bourgeois society.

Most or all of these approaches in fact have been applied to the study of professions in general or of political science in particular.¹ None of them, however, will be applied here. The data at hand shed some light on several aspects of Danish political science, but they could certainly not support an analysis along any of the lines sketched above. Thus, the aim of this paper is a much more modest one: to

The Growth of a Profession: Political Science in Denmark 1960-1975

PETER NANNESTAD
University of Aarhus

1. Introduction

When writing about political science as a profession in a political science journal, the idea is easily conceived to make the study of political science the object of a political science study. Many approaches currently applied to political phenomena could possibly serve as valuable tools in solving such a task. For example – to mention only a few possibilities – viewing (maybe erroneously) a degree in political science as a scarce value, we could pose and paraphrase the time-honored question: who gets what, when, and how? But we could as well place the profession within a functionalist framework, concentrating on the functions performed by political science for other systems or society as a whole, or alternatively on the functions necessary to keep political science going as a system of its own. We could emphasize the recruitment aspect, asking who is selected into what elites by means of becoming a member of the political science profession; or we could select the somewhat related socialization aspect, investigating what norms are transmitted and upheld through Danish political science, what roles and attitudes Danish political scientists are socialized into, and how it is done. Applying Mannheim's 'sociology of knowledge' or a full-fledged Marxist approach, we could focus on political science as part of the Danish society's superstructure, attempting to relate the twists and turns in its development to changes in other parts of the superstructure and – eventually – in the material base, the sphere of production, and the tendentially falling rate of profit, and unmasking its role as ideology in bourgeois society.

Most or all of these approaches in fact have been applied to the study of professions in general or of political science in particular.¹ None of them, however, will be applied here. The data at hand shed some light on several aspects of Danish political science, but they could certainly not support an analysis along any of the lines sketched above. Thus, the aim of this paper is a much more modest one: to

provide a description of the status quo in the Danish political science profession, based on the available material, and to draw up some discernible lines of development.

2. The Beginnings

In descriptions of the history of political science it seems customary to allude to the well-known fact, that in most countries political science is at the same time a very young and a very old academic subject. This characterization applies to political science in Denmark as well.²

Disregarding for the moment its more or less ancient roots – which there appears ample justification to do, since the relationship between modern political science in Denmark and its predecessors seems feeble, to say the least – we may choose to date Danish political science either from 1958, when it was formally established as an independent academic subject of teaching and study in the faculty of law and economics at the University of Aarhus, or from 1959, when two chairs in political science were established, the first two professors appointed and the Institute of Political Science founded at this university. Anyway, whether we compare the Danish development with the development of political science in the other Nordic countries or with other social sciences in a narrow Danish context, Danish political science must be called a latecomer to the scientific community. When surveying its development in the period 1960–75, we are in fact surveying almost its total life-span. But in this comparatively short period of its existence, Danish political science has proved itself to be a highly dynamic and viable member of the family of social sciences in Denmark.

Looking back at 1960, the starting point of this survey, the situation of political science in Denmark may be shortly summarized in the following way: an Institute of Political Science existed in the Faculty of Law and Economics at the University of Aarhus. It was staffed by two professors appointed in political science, one 'with main emphasis on the history of political thought', the other 'with main emphasis on political institutions and the political structures of society'. The number of students enrolled and studying for the degree of *Candidatus Scientiarum Politicarum* (*Cand. Scient. Pol.*) was 23. Besides the Institute of Political Science in Aarhus, an Institute of Contemporary History and Political Science had existed in the Faculty of Humanities at the University of Copenhagen since 1958. This institute, however, was not engaged in any teaching for a degree in political science and it was without means of its own. Hence, its role in the development of the study of political science was a very limited one at that time.

3. Politics as an Academic Discipline: 1960-75

Throughout most of the period of interest to us, the structure and content of the academic study of politics has been changing almost continuously. The periods with

out alterations being discussed, planned or implemented, were few and short. In part, this just reflects the simple fact that Danish political science did not spring full-blown from the head of Zeus in 1958. Many minor and major changes were introduced in the curricula to accommodate newly won scientific or pedagogical experiences. Others were introduced to adapt the study to what was assessed to be demands from the prospective market for professional political scientists. Still others may be seen as responses to demands from the students.³

Since the late 60's, this propensity to change has gained increasing impetus, first from the 'student unrest' starting in Denmark in 1968, with its pressure for new structures, new contents and hitherto unseen educational experiments, and since 1973-74 from the general economic recession with its accompanying budget cuts, scarcity of resources and consequent strong political demands for efficiency and planning in higher education. For the time being, Danish political science studies – as well as most others – are in the melting pot once again.

It would thus be tedious to attempt to give a full account of the development in the structure and content of the study of political science in Denmark. In the following, we shall concentrate on a very few, major lines of development to the exclusion of minor, often only local ones.

In retrospect there appears to have been two decisive factors finally leading to the establishment in 1958-59 of political science as an independent academic subject in Denmark. First, one may point to the almost universal thrust towards the development of a science of politics after World War II. Throughout most of Europe, institutes of political science had been established in the previous decade. The foundation of IPSA in 1949 may be seen as one particular expression of this general tendency. Second, there was in Denmark a growing interest in a new educational basis for recruitment to the civil service which up to that time had been almost totally dominated by professionals holding degrees in law or in economics.⁴

To some extent, this double focus was mirrored in the curriculum of the new academic discipline political science as it existed in 1960.⁵ Like most Danish university studies, it consisted of two parts, a 2-year 'undergraduate part' and a 3½-year 'graduate part', both made up of a series of compulsory courses and terminated by a series of examinations. The first part was composed of the following subjects: introductory political science (including political sociology); economics (to the same extent as for students of economics); constitutional, administrative and international law (to the same extent as for students of law); and a statistical description of Danish society (to the same extent as for students of economics). Thus, the first part of the study of politics was composed mainly of elements borrowed from adjacent, competing studies – law and economics – with a course in 'genuine' political science added. The relationship to the studies of law and economics was quite close at that time, as courses and examinations in legal and economic-statistical subjects were common to students of political science and students of law and economics respectively.

The second part of the study was composed of courses on the constitution and political structure in Denmark and important foreign countries; international politics and organization; history of political thought and theory of the principle of

state; and modern history. Finally, as part of their study, students had to submit a thesis on a self-chosen subject.

During the early 60's, the study underwent a series of changes. New subjects were added, mainly by proliferation of existing ones. Thus, sociology and statistics were formally introduced as independent subjects in the first part and public administration in the second. Contents in other courses in the curriculum were repeatedly reformulated.

The degree of *Cand. Scient. Pol.* was not to remain the only one available in political science for very long. From 1961 onwards, planning proceeded in an inter-university committee for the establishment of still another degree in political science.⁶ While the existing study of politics aimed mainly – but by no means exclusively – at public administration, the planned new study would aim preferably at teaching positions in the Danish high schools (*gymnasium*) and other forms of secondary education. Behind all this were plans to reform the high schools so that teaching in what was labelled 'social subjects' (*samfundsfag*) was to be given greater importance through the establishment of an independent high school branch based on social sciences as its main subject alongside the traditional branches based on sciences and mathematics, modern languages and classical languages. 'Social subjects' had been introduced in Danish secondary education long time ago by the historian and well-known politician Peter Munch, who also wrote the first textbook on that subject.⁷

These preparations finally resulted in the formal establishment of the study for the degree of *Candidatus Magisterii (Cand. Mag.)* in 'social subjects' in 1965. The nucleus of the new study was made up of 'traditional' political science subjects together with economics, history and sociology, including social psychology. Both by intent and content, it was mainly a study of politics, placed in a somewhat broader social science context.

Teaching for the new degree was taken up at the University of Copenhagen and at the University of Aarhus in 1964.⁸ In Copenhagen, the study was placed with the above mentioned Institute of Contemporary History and Political Science and in Aarhus with the Institute of Political Science, but under the supervision of the University Division of the Humanities.

To begin with, the structure of the new study was identical in both places and resembled that of most studies in the humanities aiming at teaching positions in the high schools. Besides their 'major subject' (*hovedfag*; social subjects in this case), stipulated to take about 4 years, students were requested to take one 'minor subject' (*bifag*), stipulated to take about 2 years. Most subjects taught in the humanities and some taught in the sciences could serve as a minor subject. The requirement of a 'minor subject' was at least partially abolished in 1968 when the degree of *Candidatus Philosophiae (Cand. Phil.)* was introduced for students who wanted to graduate with a 'major subject' only. It was continued, though, for students aiming at the old degree of *Cand. Mag.*

The study of 'social subjects' as 'major subject' consisted of two parts, each part terminating with a series of examinations. Part one was composed of courses in economics, modern history and social science methodology, and a statistical

description of Danish society. Part two was composed of courses in comparative politics, international politics and organization and 'legal regulations and their social functions' (sociology of law). Moreover, the students were to be examined in two self-chosen fields of specialization within comparative politics and international politics and organization, and a thesis had to be submitted.

Compared to the study leading to the degree of *Cand. Scient. Pol.* the new study of 'social subjects' differed mainly in that elements particularly relevant to public administration were eliminated.

Throughout the following years, minor changes and adjustments occurred repeatedly in the curricula of the two studies of politics. The most important reform, however, was the one finally confirmed in 1969 which affected both the study for the *Cand. Scient. Pol.* and the study of 'social subjects'. Its main aim was a better coordination of the two existing studies of politics. Especially at the institute in Aarhus, where they existed alongside and had to be taught by the same staff, the need for better coordination was felt pressing. With student enrollments mounting steadily and teaching capacity severely limited due to short supply of qualified applicants to teaching positions in political science, better utilization of available resources had become mandatory. Another factor behind the reform was some kind of 'identity crisis' for the study of the *Cand. Scient. Pol.* brought about by the new study of 'social subjects'. In a broader perspective, the new study meant that teaching positions in secondary education would be almost unavailable to graduates holding a *Cand. Scient. Pol.* degree. In other fields, strong competition could be foreseen. Taken together, these problems made the study for the *Cand. Scient. Pol.* turn more decisively than before towards public administration as the main prospective field of employment.⁹

The reform established a first part common to both studies, consisting of courses in comparative politics, economics, statistics, sociology and modern Danish political history. Thus, students henceforth were able to enroll for a study of political science without having to decide from the very beginning whether eventually to graduate as *Cand. Scient. Pol.* or as *Cand. Mag. (Cand. Phil.)*. Further, a main bloc of courses in the second part, consisting of courses in comparative politics and history of political thought, international politics and organizations, selected issues in Danish politics, and research methodology, became common to both studies, too. Besides the common courses, students aiming at the degree of *Cand. Scient. Pol.* had to take courses in constitutional, administrative and international law (still to the same extent as – and together with – students of law, while the same rule had been abolished some time ago as far as economics was concerned), and public administration. In addition, they had to take a number of courses, the contents of which were made optional to provide an opportunity for the individual student to specialize in accordance with his personal or career interests. Students studying for the degree of *Cand. Mag.* with 'social subjects' as their major subject, or for the degree of *Cand. Phil.* in 'social subjects' only, had to take an additional course in sociology of law and had to participate in an interdisciplinary social science seminar. The requirement of a thesis was upheld for both studies.

This structure still makes up the basic skeleton of the two studies of politics

available to students in Denmark today, though lots of modifications have occurred in the original structure. Local differences have developed, too, between the studies of 'social subjects' in Copenhagen and Aarhus, both in structure and – to a somewhat higher degree – in the content of the courses taught. An additional structural variation was introduced, when the study of 'social subjects' was established at the new university of Odense in 1971. As an experiment, the study is structured in a way permitting the main elements of the first part to be common to students of 'social subjects' and students of other social sciences.

Since 1969, the degree of *Licentiatius Scientiarum Politicarum* has been available at the University of Aarhus. This degree in several aspects resembles the American Ph.D. It is obtained by a thesis and examinations beyond the degrees of *Cand. Scient. Pol.*, *Cand. Mag.* or *Cand. Phil.* It is designed primarily for graduates aiming at a scientific career. So far, the establishment of this degree has not influenced the existing studies of political science.

4. Recruitment into the Profession: Student Enrollment and Developments in the Institutes of Political Science

The number of students enrolled for the study of political science at the Danish universities grew dramatically during the period 1960–1975. From a total of a mere 23 in 1960 it jumped to a total of about 2300 in 1974–75. Throughout most of the 60's, it grew at an increasing rate.

In assessing these numbers, several things must be kept in mind. First, we are looking at the 'total load' on recently established studies.¹⁰ For the period under investigation this implies that the 'outflow' of graduates has been very low. Hence, a growing volume of enrollments has to be expected.

It must be pointed out, too, that in part these numbers just reflect a general trend in the Danish system of higher education and not one peculiar to the study of politics. Throughout this period, the proportion of each youth cohort making its way into the universities has been increasing. Moreover, some of these cohorts were of extraordinary size. Consequently, several disciplines could boast of a similar development in enrollment numbers. Nevertheless, it can be seen from the statistical material available that political science received far more than just its due share of the increasing numbers of high school graduates enrolling at the universities.¹¹ Thus, from 1960 to 1970, the percentage of all high school graduates enrolling at the universities who chose the study of political science rose from 0.1 per cent to 3.7 per cent, thus running far ahead of all official forecasts.

It would be extremely interesting, of course, to know the reason for this booming interest in the study of political science. What was motivating the students? Were they in any discernible way different from the total population of students – all the others who did not opt for the study of political science?

Intriguing as they are, these questions are hard to answer. The motives of prestige or career may probably be excluded from the outset. Neither the *Cand.*

Scient. Pol. nor the *Cand. Mag.* (*Cand. Phil.*) is normally counted among the university degrees endowed with special prestige in the Danish society as, e.g., the degrees in medicine or dentistry. Moreover, throughout most of the period it has been far from evident which careers eventually would be open to persons holding the degree of *Cand. Scient. Pol.*. Studies were available – also within the social sciences – with a much better built-in guarantee of a safe career upon graduating. As for graduates holding a degree of *Cand. Mag.* or *Cand. Phil.* in ‘social subjects’, the market was somewhat better known. But the number of relevant positions in secondary education also was known to be limited, and quite soon it must have become clear to everybody that the number of students aiming at a degree in ‘social subjects’ was rapidly outgrowing the prospective number of openings. Hence, this course of study could not hold out the promise of a safe future career for its graduates either.

There is no evidence, in addition, to suggest that the immense growth in the enrollment in political science studies should have come especially from groups which previously had not been recruited into higher education to the same degree as others, e.g., females and students of lower social origin. On the contrary, in the only existing study of this problem – which admittedly may be somewhat outdated – it has been shown that such groups tend to exhibit risk-avoiding behaviour, typically opting for studies with relatively safe prospects for a future career.¹² Political science, as mentioned above, definitely does not belong in this category. Although we lack a study of the social background of Danish students of political science, there is no reason why low social origin should be expected to be more prominent among these students than among students of other subjects. In this connection it can also be mentioned that political science tends to attract a proportion of female students far below the proportion of females in the university as a whole – not to mention in society as a whole. One may assume, then, that a considerable number of students enrolled in political science out of a genuine interest in society, social problems and politics rather than out of an interest in a certain professional career. What consequences this may have for the future of the profession in Denmark can only be guessed at.

In most of the period considered here, the development of the staff of university institutes engaged in political science teaching and research can be described quite adequately as an, at times, desperate effort to keep up with the increasing number of students. These efforts were only partially successful though: the number of full-time staff members (both professors and non-professors) rose from 3 in 1960 to about 80 in 1974–75. Table I below shows the development by year, institutes and positions. As can be seen, the development in staff positions lagged somewhat behind the development in student enrollments and hence the student-teacher ratio deteriorated throughout this period.

Lack of funds was not the only explanation for this state of affairs. Throughout most of the 60's, recruitment to positions in political science institutes was difficult, since qualified Danish political scientists remained in extremely short supply. The first candidates graduated from the institute in Aarhus in 1964 and for several years to follow the output of candidates remained a mere trickle. At the same

Table I. Teaching Positions in Political Science at the Universities of Copenhagen, Aarhus, and Odense 1960-1975

	Professors			Non-professorial full-time staff***		
	Institute of Political Science, Aarhus	Institute of Contemporary History and Political Science, Copenhagen**	Odense*	Institute of Political Science, Aarhus	Institute of Contemporary History and Political Science, Copenhagen	Odense**
60-61	2	1				
61-62	2	1				
62-63	2	1		1		
63-64	3	1		3	1	
64-65	3	1		5	2	
95-66	3	1		8	2	
66-67	3	1		10	3	
67-68	3	2		11	7	
68-69	4	2		12	9	
69-70	4	2		18	11	1
70-71	5	2		19	15	1
71-72	5	2 (1)		26	14 (6)	3
72-73	5	2 (1)		28	18 (5)	4
73-74	5	2 (1)	1	29	22 (5)	5
74-75	5	3 (1)	1	30	23 (6)	7

Sources: *Aarvog for Kobenhavns Universitet - Aarhus Universitets Årsberetning - Aarsberetning fra Odense Universitet - Hof- og Statskalenderen*

*As for the University of Odense, the numbers refer to a residual group in the Institute of History and Social Sciences.

**In 1972, the institute was split into an Institute of Political Science and an Institute of Contemporary History. Numbers for the latter are given in parentheses.

***Until 1972: Docenter, afdelingsledere, (interne) lektorer, amanuenser.
After 1972: Lektorer, adjunkter.

time, Danish universities were not particularly successful in attracting foreign political scientists.

The staff of university institutes may be supposed to perform several important 'gate-keeping' functions for the profession as a whole. It is in the institutes that the students - neophytes of the profession - are introduced not only to the theories, methods and factual knowledge of the subject, but also to certain values and professional ethics. Assuming that this introduction may not be entirely independent of whoever is in charge of it, it may be of interest to briefly examine the background of the staff members of the institute.

Table II below indicates that in 1975 the professional background of those holding non-professorial positions at the institutes of political science in Aarhus and Copenhagen varied widely. Moreover, only a minority (3) of professors had a background in political science. A majority (4) had a background in history, while one had a background in law and one in economics. One professor, finally, held a doctor's degree in political science, but had a professional background in comparative literature as well. Of course, this simply reflects the fact that most of the existing professorships in political science were filled before qualified 'genuine' political scientists had been available.

Table II. Professional Background of Non-professorial Staff in Political Science at the Universities of Copenhagen, Aarhus and Odense, 1975

	Cand.Scient.Pol.	Cand.Mag./Cand.Phil. 'social subjects' (Aarhus)	Cand.Mag./Cand.Phil. 'social subjects' (Copenhagen)	Other Danish Degree	Foreign Degree
Aarhus	15	3	0	7	5
Copenhagen**	2 (1)	1	4	13 (5)	3
Odense*	3	2	0	0	2

*As for the University of Odense, the numbers refer to a residual group in the Institute of History and Social Sciences.

**Numbers in parentheses refer to the Institute of Contemporary History which was split from the original Institute of Contemporary History and Political Science in 1972.

Turning to the non-professorial staff, we also find a considerable degree of heterogeneity in the professional background of this group, as can be seen from Table II. Only in Aarhus do Danish political scientists constitute a majority. Here it has to be remembered first that the study of political science in Denmark includes courses in social science subjects other than political science proper, such as economics, sociology and history. Hence, scholars with backgrounds in these subjects had to be included in the staff of the institutes. Furthermore, the problems of recruitment to this group initially were the same as for the group of professors.

Thus, for several reasons the staff in the institutes of political science is not representative of the whole profession as far as professional background is concerned. Narrowing down our focus to the group of Danish political scientists holding positions in the institutes in Copenhagen and Aarhus, we may ask whether they differ, and in what way, from the rest of the profession. As almost everywhere, in Denmark the recruitment into university positions is based on one objective criterion only: scholarly performance. Hence we may expect political scientists recruited into university positions to differ from the rest of the profession only in attributes associated with the prominence of scholarly work. However, empirical recruitment studies in the U.S.A.¹³ have shown at least two other criteria to be used. One may be described as an 'inbreeding' tendency, i.e., a tendency to recruit new staff members from among the institutes' own graduates. The other is the prestige associated with the institute from which the applicant has graduated. Both these criteria, of course, may bring about a stronger bias in the composition of the staff vis-à-vis the rest of the profession than would be the sole effect of the 'scholarly performance' criterion.

As far as the tendency for 'inbreeding' is concerned, the data in Table II seem to reveal a similar pattern in the recruitment to positions in political science institutes in Denmark in the period under scrutiny. In 1975, not one political scientist among the incumbents of full-time positions at the institute in Aarhus had received his degree from the University of Copenhagen; they were all of local origin. In Copenhagen there appears at first glance to be a better balance between political scientists graduated from Aarhus and those graduated from the institute itself. But it must be noted that of the three members holding the degree of *Cand. Scient. Pol.* from Aarhus, one also holds a degree in 'social

subjects' (*Cand. Phil.*) from Copenhagen while the two others obtained their positions prior to 1970, i.e., at a time when no applicants with a degree from Copenhagen were in the market yet. Thus, a tendency towards recruiting from among the institute's own graduates seems visible for Copenhagen too. Whether this tendency towards inbreeding may be attributed to the fact that the institutes actively prefer their own products, or to the reverse fact, that the applicants prefer their own institute of study, cannot be decided. After all, up to the beginning of the 70's, the market for teaching positions in political science institutes was to a high degree a seller's market. Moreover, there exists a marked degree of geographic immobility in the pattern of candidate placements.

Normally, no difference in prestige is associated with obtaining degrees from the universities of Copenhagen or Aarhus. Nevertheless, the question of the prestige of degree enters into this analysis in another way. As can be seen, graduates holding the degree of *Cand. Scient. Pol.* dominate among the staff members holding a Danish degree in political science at both Aarhus and to a somewhat lesser degree Odense universities. Does this then reflect differences in prestige associated with the degrees of *Cand. Scient. Pol.* and *Cand. Mag.* or *Cand. Phil.* in 'social subjects'?

Again, part of the dominance of the *Cand. Scient. Pol.* in Aarhus must be attributed to the fact that applicants holding a degree of *Cand. Scient. Pol.* were alone in the market at least until 1970. This explanation does not cover recruitment after this period, however. But still, persons holding this degree were recruited to staff positions more frequently than those with *Cand. Mag.* or *Cand. Phil.* and out of proportion to the relative numbers of people graduating within these two groups.

Alternative explanations are available, though. In the first place, in much of this period the high schools offered those holding a degree of *Cand. Mag.* or *Cand. Phil.* in 'social subjects' a real and easy alternative which in many cases might even pay better than a position in a university. Secondly, one may hypothesize that many students eventually graduating as *Cand. Mag.* or *Cand. Phil.* had entered into the university with a high school career in mind and hence were not interested in changing their plans. It might be that a close scrutiny of applications would shed more light on this question. Unfortunately, contrary to applications for professorships, they are not made public. But even if they were, problems of anticipated reactions would pose serious difficulties for a decision on the matter.

We may conclude, then, that whatever the reason, in several respects the group of Danish political scientists on the staffs of the university institutes does not mirror the composition of the profession as a whole.

No special studies of the social origin of those recruited into staff positions in the institutes of political science exist. A recent survey of social science institutions in Denmark showed that staff members were drawn disproportionately from the higher strata of society.¹⁴

5. Candidate Production, Fields of Specialization, and Patterns of Employment

Although the first *Cand. Scient. Pol.* graduated from the University of Aarhus in 1964, and the first *Cand. Phil.* in 'social subjects' from the University of Copenhagen in 1968, the production of candidates proceeded at a slow rate of 4 to 10 a year until the beginning of the 70's. By the summer of 1975, a total of 446 degrees in political science had been awarded: 149 *Cand. Scient. Pol.* degrees from the University of Aarhus, 101 *Cand. Mag.* and *Cand. Phil.* degrees in 'social subjects' from the same university, and 196 *Cand. Mag.* or *Cand. Phil.* degrees in 'social subjects' from the University of Copenhagen.

Before turning to the careers these candidates engaged in it may be interesting to look at what fields of political science they chose to specialize in. The only way to do this is by examining the theses written for the degrees. Even if not perfectly valid, the thesis may be regarded as a usable indicator, since it occupies an important place in both studies of political science (and, presumably, in the students' minds). It is stipulated to require about half a year of concentrated work, but usually the time spent at writing a thesis is somewhat longer. Although, of course, the quality of the theses submitted vary, some of them represent instances of outstanding scholarship.

Table III below shows the theses submitted in political science at the universities of Aarhus and Copenhagen classified according to subject area by years. Extreme care should be exercised in interpreting this table. Some of the numbers are extremely small and hence subject to strong fluctuations. Worse, the classification of theses cannot always be made in an unequivocal way: often one thesis could equally well be placed in two or more different categories. Hence, the reliability and validity of the classification must be suspected to be low, and there will be great variability within the categories.

Some trends nevertheless stand out quite clearly. International politics and public administration appear to have been the most preferred single subjects with students studying for the degree of *Cand. Scient. Pol.* in this period. The proportion of students submitting theses on public administration has been growing throughout the period. This development corresponds well to the development in the general orientation of the study, especially since the reform in 1968 – and, one may assume, to the students' perception of their chances in the market for academic manpower. On the other hand, subjects like political elites and recruitment, electoral behaviour, and foreign political systems and developmental studies are clearly underrepresented. As far as electoral research – and at least partially research on political elites and recruitment – is concerned, one may suspect that until recently the students simply lacked the methodological skills and technical support necessary for empirical research in these areas. No such explanation applies to the very limited interest in foreign political systems, however. The number of theses on political theory can be seen to vary strongly with cohort.

Theses submitted by students aiming at the degree of *Cand. Phil.* or *Cand. Mag.* in 'social subjects' at the University of Aarhus during this period mainly fall

Table III. Theses Submitted for the Degree of Cand.Scient.Pol., Cand.Mag. and Cand.Phil. at the Universities of Aarhus and Copenhagen, 1964-1975 by Field and Year

Year	Political theory		Communication, political opinion, socialization		Electoral behavior, political opinion, socialization		Parties and organizations		Political elites, recruitment		Public administration		Foreign political systems, development problems		International history		General social-ogy		Economics		Other subjects		Unknown		Total				
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
Cand.	2	22	0	0	0	0	2	22	0	0	2	22	0	0	1	11	2	22	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	100	
Scient.Pol.	1	7	1	7	0	0	2	14	0	0	3	20	2	14	1	7	5	33	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	100	
Aarhus	10	22	2	4	0	0	5	11	0	0	2	4	5	11	1	2	20	43	-	-	1	2	0	0	0	0	46	100	
	7	9	6	8	3	4	5	6	1	1	1	1	25	32	7	9	19	24	-	-	3	4	2	2	2	2	79	100	
	20	13	9	6	3	2	14	9	1	0.6	8	5	32	21	10	7	46	31	-	-	4	3	2	1	149	100			
'Social Subjects'	3	10	0	0	1	3	4	14	2	7	1	3	0	0	5	17	8	28	1	3	2	7	2	7	0	0	29	100	
Aarhus	6	8	4	6	1	1	17	24	5	7	0	0	0	0	11	15	12	17	5	7	4	6	3	4	1	1	72	100	
	9	9	4	4	2	2	21	21	7	7	1	1	0	0	16	16	20	20	6	6	6	6	5	3	3	1	101	100	
'Social Subjects'	6	7	6	7	3	4	11	14	4	5	3	4	0	0	10	12	30	37	1	1	1	1	3	4	2	2	80	100	
Copenhagen	16	15	6	6	1	1	12	11	4	4	1	1	6	6	12	11	26	24	1	1	8	7	8	7	7	6	108	100	
	22	12	12	6	4	2	23	12	8	4	4	2	6	3	22	12	56	30	2	1	9	5	11	6	9	5	0	188*	100

*This number does not equal the total number of degrees awarded, since it includes all these submitted in 1975, and since several students are allowed to cooperate on the same thesis.

within three fields of specialization: international politics, foreign political systems and parties and organizations. Theses in the latter field can be seen often to concentrate on certain historical events and the role and strategy of particular organizations or parties in this situation rather than on parties or organizations as parapolitical systems.

Even if students aiming at the degree of *Cand. Scient. Pol.* and students of 'social subjects' at the University of Aarhus seem to share interest in the field of international politics, nevertheless their theses within this field tended to have a somewhat different focus: thus, the subject of international organizations and theory of integration plays a lesser role with students of 'social subjects' than with the other group.

As for the theses submitted at the University of Copenhagen, the picture is surprisingly much the same as at the University of Aarhus, with international politics the preferred area of specialization followed by parties and organizations, foreign political systems and political theory. It is of special interest to note that students of 'social subjects' in Copenhagen did not, as students of 'social subjects' in Aarhus, totally abstain from submitting theses on public administration.

As has been pointed out before, there was no guarantee what reception the new candidates would receive upon entering, i.a., the market for civil service positions, when the study of political science was originally established at the University of Aarhus. In accordance with continental European practice, Danish public administration traditionally has been dominated by civil servants with backgrounds in law or – more recently – in economics. It was an open question whether the bearers of the new degree of *Cand. Scient. Pol.* would be able to stand the competition against older and well-established groups.

As can be seen from Table IV, the venture must be deemed at least a relative success. At the beginning, a substantial part of the graduates with a *Cand. Scient. Pol.* degree did not attempt an administrative career. They remained in the universities or went into secondary education. But since then, a sizeable and growing part of the candidate output has been able to obtain positions in public administration, both at the central and regional levels. From the early 70's, the civil service became the most important single employer of political scientists holding the degree of *Cand. Scient. Pol.* It must be pointed out, though, that part of the success of the political scientists in the market may be attributed to the universal and strong expansion of the public sector in the early 70's with its associated demand for academic manpower with almost every kind of qualification. Nevertheless, when the situation turned worse in 1973–74, political scientists still were able to obtain positions in the civil service. The unemployment lately experienced by graduates holding a degree of *Cand. Scient. Pol.* is not a problem peculiar to this group, but part of an almost universal pattern.

As for graduates holding the *Cand. Mag.* or *Cand. Phil.* degrees in 'social subjects' the market was defined somewhat better. As can be seen from Table IV, a considerable part of the output of candidates selecting this area of study from the University of Aarhus went into higher education. Other categories, like university positions or civil service, played a less important role for this group. The category

Table IV. Employment of Political Scientists who from 1964 to 1975 Graduated with a Degree of *Cand. Scient. Pol.* from the University of Aarhus or a Degree of *Cand. Mag.* or *Cand. Phil.* from the Universities of Aarhus and Copenhagen (By 1976)

	Year	Universities and research institutions		Secondary education		Public administration		Organizations and business		Mass media		Students		Other and unknown		Total	%
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
Cand. Scient. Pol. Aarhus	64-66	6	67	0	0	1	11	1	11	1	11	0	0	0	0	9	100
	67-69	5	33	3	20	3	20	1	7	1	7	0	0	2	13	15	100
	70-72	13	28	10	22	18	39	1	2	0	0	0	0	4	9	46	100
	73-75	10	13	7	9	30	39	5	6	0	0	0	0	27	35	77	100
'Social Subjects' Aarhus	64-75	34	23	20	13	52	35	8	5	2	1	0	0	33	22	149	100
	71-72	1	3	26	90	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	0	0	29	100
	73-75	6	8	38	53	2	3	0	0	0	0	9	12	17	24	72	100
'Social Subjects' Copenhagen	71-75	7	7	64	64	2	2	0	0	0	0	11	11	17	17	101	100
	68-75	16	8	97	50	12	6	0	0	2	1	14	7	55	28	196	100

'other and unknown' mostly represent unemployed and graduates under mandatory pedagogical instruction (*pædagogicum*) without regular positions in the high schools (*lærerkandidater*).

As far as candidates from the University of Copenhagen are concerned, unfortunately only the totals were made available.¹⁵ Here, too, secondary education of different kinds is seen to dominate the picture. The number of graduates from Copenhagen – although numerically small – employed in public administration appears quite interesting. Even if this number includes some people who supplemented their degree of *Cand. Mag.* or *Cand. Phil.* with a degree of *Cand. Scient. Pol.*, graduates holding a degree 'social subjects' from the University of Copenhagen obviously show less reluctance toward a career in public administration than their counterparts from the University of Aarhus, as also could be seen from their selection of topics for the thesis. It may be conjectured, however, that this can be explained by the coexistence in Aarhus of both courses of study. Students aiming at a career in public administration simply would not choose 'social subjects' when studying at the University of Aarhus.

In the distribution of graduates with a degree in 'social subjects' a marked geographical immobility can be discerned. Thus, high schools in Jutland are strongly dominated by graduates from the University of Aarhus, whereas Copenhagen and its surroundings are dominated by graduates from the University of

Copenhagen. To the degree differences exist in the backgrounds of graduates from the universities of Aarhus and Copenhagen, the teaching of 'social subjects' in the high schools will be influenced differently in different parts of the country.

6. Concluding Remarks: A Prolegomenon to an Epitaph or a Monument to a Successful Venture?

The general picture drawn above of the development of the political science profession in Denmark has been a bright one, and not unjustifiably so. Looking back at the period 1960–75, Danish political science may be called a successful venture. Nevertheless, the last years of the period considered have held ominous forebodings although they may not be clearly visible in the material presented. On two points of importance to the profession as a whole – employment and development of political science institutes in the universities – things lately have been worsening. One may only guess what the situation of the profession will be at the end of this decade.

NOTES

1. See, e.g., Stuart S. Blume, *Toward a Political Sociology of Science* (New York: The Free Press, 1974), and especially for a Marxist approach to the analysis of political science, Bernhard Blanke, Ullrich Jürgens, Hans Kastendieck, *Kritik der politischen Wissenschaft* (Frankfurt: Campus Verlag, 1975).
2. Sven Henningsen and Erik Rasmussen, 'Political Research in Scandinavia 1960–65: Denmark', *Scandinavian Political Studies*, Vol. I, 1966, pp. 254–257 (A1).
3. Contributions to the debate from teachers and students may be found in *Politica*, Vol. II, No. 4, 1969.
4. Sven Henningsen and Erik Rasmussen, *op.cit.*, p. 255.
5. Kgl. Anordning nr. 253 af 1.8.1958.
6. *Arbog for Københavns Universitet 1964–65*.
7. Peter Munch, *Erindringer 1870–1909* (Copenhagen: Nyt Nordisk Forlag, 1959), pp. 138–141.
8. According to Sven Henningsen and Erik Rasmussen, *op.cit.*, p. 257, teaching was taken up at the University of Copenhagen in 1965. Nevertheless in 'Forelæsninger og øvelser ved Københavns Universitet 1964–65', pp. 85–86, courses in 'social subjects' are already listed.
9. See Mogens N. Pedersen, 'Ny studieordning for statskundskab/samfundsfag', *Økonomen*, Vol. 16, No. 21, pp. 447–451.
10. The numbers refer to the situation as of October 1 every year.
11. *De videregående uddannelser 1960–1970*, Copenhagen, governmental publication, 1971.
12. Theodor Geiger, *De danske studenters sociale oprindelse* (Copenhagen: Gad, 1950).
13. D. Crane, 'Scientists at Major and Minor Universities', *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 30, 1965. My attention was drawn to Crane's results by a paper of Kjell A. Eliassen and Ole P. Kristensen, *Det akademiske Marked*, Århus, 1976. For a less complimentary view of the academic recruitment process in America see Lionel S. Lewis, *Scaling the Ivory Tower: Merit and Its Limits in Academic Careers* (Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press, 1975).
14. Merete Watt Boolsen and Ole Aagaard Sørensen, *Samfundsvidenskabelige institutioner og publikationer i Danmark*, Copenhagen, 1976, pp. 50–51. The Institute of Political Science at the University of Aarhus was in the survey. The data show that as a whole the staff of this institute was of relatively low social origin.
15. 'Samfundsfagskandidaters beskæftigelse', *Information fra studievejledningen* No. C.6, Copenhagen, 1976. The data could not be made available for reasons of anonymity.