

---

# Introduction: In the Name of ‘Europe’

KEVIN FEATHERSTONE

What does ‘Europeanization’ mean? How does it affect domestic politics and policies? More particularly, how is it evident in the ideas, interests, behaviour, and settings of domestic politics? Is ‘Europeanization’ an irreversible process? Does it mean convergence across Europe? How and why do differences remain? These questions are at the heart of this volume.

‘Europeanization’ has gained widespread currency amongst scholars as a newly fashionable term to denote a variety of changes within European politics and international relations. Interestingly, other branches of the social sciences use the term much less often. Yet, the faddish use of ‘Europeanization’ in different contexts can easily obscure its substantive meaning. The purpose of this volume is to bring recognized experts in the field together to distinguish the conceptual meaning of ‘Europeanization’ and to analyse its empirical implications.

In order to set the context, this chapter seeks to chart the uses of the term ‘Europeanization’ and to clarify how it will be used in the rest of the volume. The aim is to provide some structure to the potential confusion of the uninitiated reader, whilst also mapping out key research areas.

‘Europeanization’—like ‘globalization’—can be a useful entry-point for greater understanding of important changes occurring in our politics and society. The obligation of the researcher is to give it a precise meaning. ‘Europeanization’ has little value if it merely repeats an existing notion. It is not a simple synonym for European regional integration or even convergence, though it does overlap with aspects of both. As a term for the social sciences, it can range over history, culture, politics, society, and economics. It is a process of structural change, variously affecting actors and institutions, ideas and interests. In a maximalist sense, the structural change that it entails must fundamentally be of a phenomenon exhibiting similar attributes to those that predominate in, or are closely identified with, ‘Europe’. Minimally, ‘Europeanization’ involves a response to the policies of the European Union (EU).<sup>1</sup> Significantly, even in the latter context, the

<sup>1</sup> The impact of these policies may not necessarily be one of convergence, however (Héritier and Knill 2000).

scope of ‘Europeanization’ is broad, stretching across existing member states and applicant states, as the EU’s weight across the continent grows.

Empirical analysis can gauge the scope and significance of the adjustments involved: ‘Europeanization’ is, to put it somewhat crudely, a matter of degree. It also has a dynamic quality: its structural effects are not necessarily permanent or irreversible. With respect to regional integration, this is one major reason why ‘Europeanization’ is not a new label for ‘neofunctionalism’ (Haas 1958). The impact of Europeanization is typically incremental, irregular, and uneven over time and between locations, national and subnational. Profound disparities of impact remain—it is inherently an asymmetric process—and the attraction for researchers is to account for them. The ontology of ‘Europeanization’ is also complex. Within the international system, the relationship between ‘Europeanization’ and ‘globalization’ is often difficult to distinguish in case studies of domestic adaptation, obscuring the key independent variable (for a preliminary discussion, see Hennis 2001). In addition, Caporaso (1996) has argued that ‘the study of European integration is moving into a post-ontological stage’, meaning that ‘scholars are less concerned with how to categorize [the EU] than how to explain process and outcome’ (1996: 30). Within this frame, analytical difficulties remain. Cause and effect in the ‘Europeanization’ process can be deceptive: for example, relatively ‘small’ and technical EU obligations may have widespread domestic ramifications in certain settings and be a subterfuge for further changes.<sup>2</sup> Further, the relationship between structure and agency is by no means simple. Actors can be of different types: individual, collective, or corporate. Within the process of ‘Europeanization’, structure and agency are best understood as being inherently relational concepts (Bhaskar 1979; Giddens 1984; Checkel 1998). Agency within the ‘Europeanization’ process is not only structured, but may also be structuring, as actors ‘lead’ (Dyson and Featherstone 1999: 776–82). Dauntingly, the study of ‘Europeanization’ does not fit easily ‘the language of dependent and independent variables and the logic of regression analysis’ (Olsen 1996: 271). Transformation may occur on the basis of ‘a multitude of coevolving, parallel and not necessarily tightly coupled processes’ (Olsen 1996: 271).<sup>3</sup>

Given these general characteristics, how might ‘Europeanization’ be applied in the social sciences? A survey of the literature over the last two

<sup>2</sup> For example, EU transparency rules for the financial accounts of institutions have had major implications for pension fund bodies in Greece (Featherstone *et al.* 2001).

<sup>3</sup> In a more recent study, Olsen has further refined the research agenda (2002). Included in his agenda is a focus on ‘how institutional transformation may be understood as an ecology of mutual adaptation and coevolving institutions, including a (varying) number of interacting processes of change’ (2002: 23).

decades that has referred to ‘Europeanization’ reveals the diversity of applications attached to the term.

### A Typology of ‘Europeanization’

The usage of the term ‘Europeanization’ in the social science literature has increased rapidly in recent years. Table 1.1 is based on a survey of some 116 academic journal articles as listed in the ‘Social Sciences Citation Index’. It indicates that only five articles (4 per cent) referring to ‘Europeanization’ were published in the 1980s. Four of these were concerned with foreign policy. By contrast, twenty-seven articles (23 per cent) were published between 1990–5 and 1984 (73 per cent) since. The breadth of application has been wide-ranging. Table 1.2 categorizes the main focus of the articles published between 1981 and 2000. Combining the individual entries, the table indicates that ‘Europeanization’ is applied within four broad categories: as an historical process; as a matter of cultural diffusion; as a process of institutional adaptation; and as the adaptation of policy and policy processes. The first two are maximalist interpretations and have little direct connection to the impact of the European Union. The other two categories are minimalist and are more

TABLE 1.1 *Number of academic articles referring to ‘Europeanization’<sup>a</sup>*

1981–8	3
1989	2
1990	1
1991	4
1992	2
1993	9
1994	8
1995	3
1996	5
1997	6
1998	7
1999	20
2000	24
2001	22

<sup>a</sup> The table shows the total number of articles with ‘Europeanization’ or ‘Europeanization’ as a subject term, in all languages, listed for each year in the Social Sciences Citation Index, as reported via the ‘ISI Web of Science’ database.

TABLE 1.2 *Focus of articles on 'Europeanization', 1981–2000<sup>a</sup>*

Focus category	% of total
Historical process	5.6
Cultural diffusion	12.5
Central government	8.3
NGOs	8.3
Subnational authorities	11.1
Political parties	4.2
Policy and policy process	33.3
Foreign relations	16.7

<sup>a</sup> Articles categorized by author according to journal abstract,  $N = 70$ .

closely linked to the operation of the European Union. The conclusions from both tables are that the increasing usage of 'Europeanization' appears to reflect a shift of research agenda, as well as of fashion. The general trends in the literature can be considered within this fourfold typology.

#### *'Europeanization' as a Historic Phenomenon*

'Europeanization' has taken on different meanings throughout modern history (Mjoset 1997). It has referred to the 'export' of European authority and social norms: imperial control, institutional organization and practices, social and cultural beliefs, values, and behaviour. 'Europeanization' is used in this way by historians to describe the export of cultural norms and patterns (e.g. Kohout 1999). Imperial endeavours by Britain, France, Spain, and Portugal linked civilization with the spread of European norms and habits.

But what constitutes 'Europe' and who are 'Europeans' has also been the basis, historically, of the separation of social identities and interests within the broad geographical area understood today as 'Europe'. Anthropologists, for example, use 'Europeanization' to characterize changes in early human society and the shift of ethnic groups (e.g. Cesnys 1991; Poruciuc 1993). In later history, religious cleavages reinforced such points of distinction. The religious affiliations of southern Europe, for example, would in the past have been both mutually exclusive and the basis of a clear divide with the present 'core' EU states, questioning the meaning of 'Europe' and 'Europeans'. Orthodox Greece, Muslim Turkey, Catholic Italy, Spain, and Portugal stand in contradistinction to the mix of Catholicism and Protestantism in the north. In the modern period, 'Europeanization' has often meant adaptation to west

European norms and practices, acknowledging the ‘pull’ to convergence of the major powers of the region (Diamandouros 1994).

### *Transnational Cultural Diffusion*

A second category of application sees ‘Europeanization’ as increasing transnationalism: that is, the diffusion of cultural norms, ideas, identities, and patterns of behaviour on a cross-national basis within Europe. The usage of ‘Europeanization’ in this category tends to be very broad. At a cultural level, ‘Europeanization’ has been applied to a shift in drinking habits in Iceland (Olafsdottir *et al.* 1997) and identities in relation to engagement with football (Maguire *et al.* 1999). ‘Europeanization’ affects wider social activities such as education (Seitter 1993). It has been used to describe changes in political culture (Pamir 1994; Borneman and Fowler 1997); and, more specifically, a redefinition of citizenship (Joppke 1995) and a shift in ideology (Gransow 1982). An interesting case of ‘Europeanization’ is that involving the cultural assimilation of European-based notions of human rights and citizenship by Turkish immigrants in Germany (Soysal 1994). In each of these examples, the factors prompting ‘Europeanization’ appear to have at best an indirect linkage to the activities of the European Union.

### *Institutional Adaptation*

The above examples notwithstanding, ‘Europeanization’ today is most often associated with domestic adaptation to the pressures emanating directly or indirectly from EU membership. This perspective can be seen as refracting the integration-building processes underway at the EU level or as part of a ‘second-image reversed’ process (Gourevitch 1986). The first category of applications here refers to how actors and institutions have been affected.

With respect to the latter, ‘Europeanization’ is used to denote how public administrative institutions at the centre have adapted to the obligations of EU membership (Benoit 1997; Wessels 1998; Agh 1999; Harmsen 1999; Bulmer and Burch 2001). ‘Historical institutionalism’ lends itself to studies in which domestic (and/or EU) institutions have an intervening effect on actor preferences and interests in the short term, and a sufficiently stronger impact over the longer term, to establish distinct paths of development in policies and institutions (Bulmer and Burch 1998). In a more distinctive approach, Rometsch and Wessels (1996) went further and argued that there has been a ‘fusion’ of national and European institutions in the policy cycle, though only a partial convergence of political systems.

‘Europeanization’ is also identified with the adaptation of other institutional actors in the domestic political process. Significantly, a change at the

level of parliamentary politics (Agh 1999*a,b*) and in the behaviour of organised interests in central Europe (Finkhaffner 1998) connects 'Europeanization' with the transition to democracy in the region. Some authors have detected a shift towards 'Europeanization' on the part of political parties (Ladrech 1994; Daniels 1998; Holden 1999; cf. Mair 2000; Cole 2001). In a similar vein, 'Europeanization' has been applied to a transformation in the roles of non-governmental actors: such as trade unions (Turner 1996); universities (Dineen 1992); the legal system (Levitsky 1994); and the wider public sector (Jorgensen 1999). This is an area in which it is especially important to differentiate the processes of 'Europeanization' with respect to a change in elite behaviour from the assumptions of neofunctionalism, which posited a shift by elites in favour of integration. Some years ago, Kerr (1973) referred to the cognitive and affective response of actors participating within European institutions. If written now, no doubt their response would be seen as being one of 'Europeanization'.

A large number of studies relate 'Europeanization' to the strengthening of subnational governance (Goldsmith 1993; Martin 1993; Goetz 1995; John and LeGalès 1997; John and Whitehead 1997). This interpretation is consistent with the notion that the European Union is encouraging 'the emergence of "multilevel governance" ... [drawing] some previously centralized functions of the state up to the supranational level and some down to the local/regional level' (Marks 1993: 392). Case studies have given further empirical support to this thesis: for example, in otherwise centralizing states in southern Europe (Kazamias and Featherstone 2000) and the United Kingdom (John 1996; see also Goldsmith and Sperling 1997; for a comparison, see Goldsmith and Klausen 1997). Goetz (1995) found that Europeanization had affirmed, if not reinforced, key structural principles of German federalism. Goldsmith (this volume) surveys the state of the current literature on this aspect.

The notion of power and participation being dispersed is also found in studies of EU policy making which identify actors engaged in policy networks of a horizontal and vertical nature (Rhodes *et al.* 1996). In one of the most comprehensive accounts of this approach, Kohler-Koch and Eising (1999: 268) have argued that 'we are currently witnessing a transformation towards a network mode of governance at the level of the European Community'. Given the peculiar characteristics of the EU polity (its multilevel structure; the combination of supranational and inter-governmental elements; the strength of the judiciary; the functional and technocratic style; the heterogeneity and fluidity of the actors involved over the different policy phases), the emergence of a predominantly network mode of governance—as opposed to pluralism, statism, and corporatism—is seen as inevitable. The focus here is on how EU policies develop and the role of EU actors in the process, rather than domestic impacts and response. The precise impact of the new mode of governance on the distribution of power is not always closely defined, however, nor the appropriate 'test' for the falsification of the argument.

The restructuring of power within bargaining relations is most readily accounted for within the framework of 'rational choice institutionalism' (e.g. Scharpf 1988, 1997; Tsebelis 1994, 1995; Garrett and Tsebelis 1996). 'Europeanization' emphasizes how interests and capabilities might be redefined across a 'two-level' bargaining structure (Putnam 1988) or as involving 'nested games' (Tsebelis 1990). This complex interpenetration between the 'domestic' and the 'European' level creates a variety of opportunities for actors to exploit. First, governments can identify strategic advantages in being bound by EU commitments (Grande 1994, 1995; Moravcsik 1994). Second, differentiation may be made between 'core' and 'peripheral' states according to their relative impact on bargaining and policy outcomes. For example, individually, and even collectively, the southern states managed to have little distinctive impact on the elaboration of the EMU agreement of 1991 (Dyson and Featherstone 1999; Featherstone *et al.* 2000). Third, domestic actors may seek to be bound by EU constraints in order to obtain otherwise elusive reform at home and strategic advantage over their rivals, within or beyond government institutions. Dyson and Featherstone (1996, 1999) termed this strategy one of seeking to exploit a 'vincolo esterno' (external tie). They noted how technocrats in Italy viewed membership of EMU as an external constraint by which to impose fiscal and monetary discipline on the often-errant instincts of politicians in the old 'partitocrazia'. Giuliani (2000) found domestic empowerment in Italy from the European Union across a broader range of actors and policy spheres. Case studies in Ross and Martin (forthcoming) gave further evidence of a vincolo esterno strategy. By contrast, Featherstone *et al.* (2001), in their study of attempted pension reform in Greece, reported the weakness of technocratic empowerment resulting from the EMU commitment in the face of wider social and political obstacles ('veto-points'). The restructuring of bargaining relations is explicitly incorporated into several conceptual frameworks of 'Europeanization', as will be seen later.

'Europeanization' can also be seen as a defensive strategy with respect to the onset of 'globalization', and the neoliberalism associated with it. EMU offers currency stability within Europe and a defence against the US dollar. More generally, globalization is seen as a threat to the 'European social model' and joint action within the European Union might enable the latter to be sustained. Wincott's contribution to this volume discusses the clash of paradigms involved in this social policy debate and the ability of European states to exert regulatory authority. Such a focus illustrates the overlap between discussions of institutional settings and of policy adaptation.

### *Adaptation of Policies and Policy Processes*

It is clear from Table 1.1 that the largest single category of contemporary applications relates to the public policy impacts of EU membership, though

this grouping includes a variety of perspectives. Some emphasize the constraints on domestic policy posed by EU regulation. Examples here are Rothstein *et al.* (1999), Lecher and Rub (1999), Jordan (1998), Radaelli (1997), Eberlein (1997), Featherstone (1998), and Mangen (1996). A variant of this perspective is to note the juxtaposition of European Union and national regulatory systems, with the former in a process of replacing the latter (Abraham and Lewis 1999) or even potentially vice versa (Mazey 1998). Others note the indirect effects of the EU's role on national policy: e.g. Radaelli (1997) again, Chapman and Murie (1996), Benington and Taylor (1993), Nilson (1993), and Doogan (1992).

The recognition of domestic inputs into EU policy making as 'Europeanization' properly equates with more traditional notions of integration. Andersen (1995) examined the conditions under which the European Union could establish common policies. Venturelli (1993) analysed the scope for EU policy specifically in broadcasting, Mazey (1998) the difficulties of an EU regime for women's rights, and Lawton (1999) the development of a European airline policy. Groux *et al.* (1993) focused on the role of the ETUC as an EU-level actor. The common thread here is of building something new at the EU level, possibly involving a transfer of sovereignty.

Amongst scholars of international relations, the use of 'Europeanization' as a term has reflected the evolution of EU foreign policy coordination itself. Keatinge (1983: 138) was one of the first authors to refer to the 'Europeanization of foreign policy', in his study of how Irish policy had been reoriented as a consequence of EC entry. Shortly afterwards, Saeter (1984) applied a similar perspective to West Germany. Such usage was rare, however, as a result of the late, modest, and faltering development of EC competencies in this area. In the different context of NATO, a shift in its mode of operation, towards strengthening the European 'pillar', has been regarded as a process of 'Europeanization' (Charles and Albright 1984; Wallace 1994; Knutsen 1996). Such usage is unusual in suggesting 'Europeanization' as a synonym for regional cooperation, though it has a particular relevance juxtaposed to 'Atlanticism'. Allen (1998: 56–7) prefers the term 'Brusselization' to denote the emergence of the EU as a foreign policy actor. 'Europeanization' has also been linked to the involvement of European states in conflicts taking place elsewhere in the world. Gurbey (1999) referred to the 'Europeanization' of the Kurdish conflict; Salih (1989) the war in Africa. Here, the meaning relates to both cooperation and external intervention.

'Europeanization' as a process of domestic adaptation in the area of foreign policy became a more frequently used term with the growing importance of the 'European Political Cooperation' (EPC) process in the late 1980s, the development of the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) after Maastricht in 1991, and shifts consequent on the collapse of Communism. Heimann (1990) and Langewiesche (1999) identify such a shift on the part of

Germany, whilst Yost (1996) does so for France, and Torreblanca (2001) for Spain. Many of the case studies of national foreign policies in the European Union, contained in the volume edited by Manners and Whitman (2000), use 'Europeanization' to denote domestic adaptation as a result of EU membership. Yet a contrast probably still exists between the significance of EU pressures in this sphere and those in many areas of economic and social policy, as a result of foreign policy cooperation remaining the preserve of national sovereignty. Whilst 'the delegation of policy competences (in foreign affairs)... has had a limited impact on domestic policy choices' (Hix and Goetz 2000: 6), the more general impact of EU membership, or even the prospect of it, has in some cases led to a profound national reorientation. These more general effects are most glaring in states aspiring to join the club. Agh (1999*b*) detects such a change in 'East Central Europe', Kazan and Waever (1994) on the part of Turkey, Featherstone (2000) for Cyprus. Each of these cases refers to the strengthening of European institutions and/or the convergence of national policies to what are perceived to be the needs of 'Europe'. The relationship between these two dimensions is a matter that will be pursued further below.

Participation in EU institutions and processes is often linked to a domestic policy convergence or mimicry between member states. There are several aspects here that would need to be 'unpacked' for careful analysis (Bennett 1991; Radaelli this volume). Andersen and Eliassen identify the European Union 'as a system of transnational authority and policy-making', and they describe the effect, rather awkwardly, as 'Europeification' (1993: 255–6). In another comparative volume, Hanf and Soetendorp apply 'Europeanization' to 'a process in which Europe, and especially the European Union, become an increasingly more relevant and important point of political reference for the actors at the level of the member states', and the latter engage in intergovernmental and transnational policy networks that reach from Brussels into the domestic sphere (1998: 1). Mény *et al.* (1996) take a wider perspective. They posit a convergence process in which there is a 'progressive emergence of a bundle of common norms of action, the evolution of which escapes the control of any particular member state and yet decisively influences the behaviour of public policy actors' (1996: 8–9). Evidence for convergence can be found at three levels: the emergence of a European political agenda (the process of problem definition shifts to the European level); the forms of interest representation (for example, corporatism threatened by more open and competitive modes of representation); and the modes of operation of various actors. They do indeed find a convergence of public policies in Europe, but argue that in the absence of an arbitrating agency at the top, this constitutes a 'kind of cooperative federalism without a state' (1996: 17).

The key point here is that of causality, between structure and agency: convergence may occur as a loose transnational phenomenon and may be described

as ‘Europeanization’; but for the European Union to be identified as a prime agent, or facilitating structure, in this process requires evidence of direct causal effect. Convergence as a result of EU participation is far from being inevitable. Integration has significant asymmetrical effects (Héritier and Knill 2000) and has been incremental, irregular, and uneven. It is these qualities of differentiation that serve to restructure the interests and ideas of actors at the domestic level, providing the scope for advocacy coalitions on particular policies (Sabatier 1998).

### **‘Europeanization’ as a Conceptual Framework**

This bibliographical survey has explored the range of different dimensions along which ‘Europeanization’ has been applied. It would be misleading, however, to suggest that ‘Europeanization’ has been widely used as a stand-alone conceptual framework. Instead, relevant studies—as already indicated above—are often couched within longer-established meta-theoretical frames—‘new institutionalism’; liberal intergovernmentalism; multilevel governance; and policy networks (Marks 1996: 39–63; cf. Peterson and Bomberg 1999)—with ‘Europeanization’ as a loose epithet.

Whilst many use the term ‘Europeanization’, few writers have sought to define its precise meaning. Ladrech (1994) provided one of the first definitions and this has been widely cited. He saw ‘Europeanization’ as ‘a process reorienting the direction and shape of politics to the degree that EC political and economic dynamics become part of the organizational logic of national politics and policy-making’ (1994: 69). Inherent in this conception is the notion that actors redefine their interests and behaviour to meet the imperatives, norms, and logic of EU membership. Whilst it has the strength of incorporating both ‘politics’ and ‘policy-making’, it remains a somewhat loose definition. It is generally compatible with the domestic dimension of earlier neofunctionalist theory. It is unclear how this helps the analyst to gauge the extent of ‘Europeanization’.

The analysis of ‘Europeanization’ in relation to foreign policy cooperation and adaptation has been obliged to take into account the relative weakness of EU competencies in this area, as compared to many aspects of market regulation. Perhaps as a result, the perspective developed by authors in this area has been wide, sometimes cutting across different strands of ‘new institutionalism’. Tonra (Manners and Whitman 2000: 245) identified ‘Europeanization’ of foreign policy as: ‘a transformation in the way in which national foreign policies are constructed, in the ways in which professional roles are defined and pursued and in the consequent internalization of norms and expectations arising from a complex system of collective European policy making’.

Smith (2000: 617–28) elaborated four major indicators of domestic adaptation to EU foreign policy cooperation: elite socialization; bureaucratic reorganization; constitutional change; and the increase in public support for EPC/CFSP. Participation in EU processes has impacts on national foreign policy cultures, because of their inherent features: they involve regular communication and consultation between states; the latter remain confidential and develop trust; decisions are made by consensus; and issues that are highly sensitive to one or more states are considered ‘off-limits’ (2000: 616). These features promote a focus on ‘problem solving’ that is conducive to the forging of common positions. He argues that procedure and culture are important—EU norms reorient those found at the domestic level—but there remains some ambiguity over whether he is also claiming an impact on national policy preferences.

It is what Goetz (2000: 222) terms the ‘missing link’ between (EU-level) pressures for change and the perceived (domestic) substantive adaptations that connects studies of Europeanization in different fields. The ontological challenge is to clarify the role of structure and agency within the Europeanization process, whilst identifying the mechanisms that are the interactive link between the ‘domestic’ and the ‘EU’ spheres of activity.

Olsen (1996) sought to capture ‘Europeanization’ for comparative politics, relating it to earlier perspectives on national integration and differentiation. In this perspective, European nation-states ‘are integrating and disintegrating in non-synchronized ways’, and Europeanization highlights an important dimension to the changes underway in domestic systems (March and Olsen 1995). Olsen saw the process in a largely EU-centric and top-down fashion, arguing that the future impact of the EU is still to be determined according to its own evolving policy balance.<sup>4</sup> In a more recent paper, Olsen (2002) distinguishes five possible uses of the term ‘Europeanization’ that parallel the typology developed here in the previous section. This new schema is broader than the European Union and is not exclusively ‘top-down’, in that it incorporates institution building at the European level.

‘Europeanization’ is most often placed within some type of institutional perspective. In a large comparative study, Caporaso *et al.* (2001) see ‘Europeanization’ as political institutionalization. This ‘involves the development of formal and informal rules, procedures, norms, and practises governing politics at the European, national, and subnational levels’. Their focus is on cross-level political interactions, interpreted within the framework of historical institutionalism.

<sup>4</sup> The impact of Europeanization on the nation-state, he argued, ‘will depend on the future emphasis of political, economic, cultural, and social integration; that is, the relative priority given to building a European polity, a market, a welfare society, or a culture’ (1996: 264). With this in mind, he differentiates between a political agenda of developing institutions for market regulation; reallocation of resources; reinterpretation and reeducation of citizens and culture; and reorganization of the democratic polity.

They recognize different levels on which Europeanization may take place: institution-building at the European level; the impact of EU membership at the national level; and as a response to globalization. This is a useful and broad perspective, though some will not like the focus extending beyond domestic impacts. In any event, its specific empirical application again depends on further interpretation.

In one of the most explicit frameworks developed to date, Knill and Lehmkuhl (1999) outline three mechanisms of 'Europeanization'. By contrast to Caporaso *et al.*, their focus is exclusively 'top-down'. Each mechanism involves (policy) constraints from the European level that may yield domestic institutional change. Other forms of 'Europeanization'—as institutionalization at the EU level, as transnationalism between states—are not accounted for. The first mechanism they identify takes the form of 'positive integration' and is found when EU obligations prescribe an institutional model to which domestic arrangements have to be adjusted, with limited national discretion. They cite EU policy on environmental protection; health and safety at work; consumer protection; and some aspects of social policy. Europeanization here rests on the institutional 'goodness of fit' of domestic and European arrangements. The second mechanism is labelled 'negative integration' and occurs where EU legislation alters the domestic rules of the game. They cite the single market as an example. The impact is to alter the 'domestic opportunity structures' entailed in the distribution of power and resources between actors. Here, it is not a question of institutional fit or misfit, but rather 'the extent to which European policies have altered the strategic position of domestic actors' (1999: 3). The third, and weakest, mechanism is where European policy alters the beliefs and expectations of domestic actors, which may in turn involve a change of preferences and strategies, as well as institutional adaptation. They see this mechanism as one of 'framing integration', affecting perceptions.

The typology builds on much of the existing literature. The first mechanism reflects a new institutionalist (especially historical institutionalist) perspective on adaptation. The second can be related to multilevel bargaining games and rational choice. Sidney Tarrow (1994) applied the notion of 'political opportunity structures' to the analysis of social movements. The explanation of outcomes on the basis of actors seizing 'opportunities' may run a teleological risk: can opportunities be identified independently of the outcome? It can serve, though, a heuristic purpose. The third mechanism can be linked to sociological institutionalism (Checkel 1997, 1999) and to the work of Schoen and Rein (1994) on frame reflection. Although the typology does not cover all aspects of what might be reasonably termed 'Europeanization', as a schema of domestic structural transformation it represents significant conceptual refinement and it offers a set of empirical questions to the researcher. Not

least, it stresses the potential significance of divergences between different national settings, accommodating the asymmetries of the process.

This aspect is taken further in the recent work of Schmidt. In an early article, she identified three key dimensions of adjustment: the economic, the institutional, and the ideational (1997). More recently, she has explored further the ‘mechanics’ of economic policy adjustment, thereby addressing the concerns raised by Goetz that were noted above. The impact of EU policies, Schmidt argues, has had different domestic effects in member states, depending on a number of intervening variables (2002). The primary attribute of EU policies, in this regard, is how narrowly they specify rules of implementation. The mirror-image is set by the mediating factors found within each domestic setting:

- (i) the economic vulnerability to global and European pressures;
- (ii) the political institutional capacity to respond as necessary;
- (iii) the ‘fit’ of EU policies with national policy legacies and preferences; and,
- (iv) the discourses that influence policy preferences and thus affect the sense of vulnerability and capacity.

The combination of these factors explains the outcomes of inertia, absorption, or transformation across states. Again, the approach builds on the works of several authors and it presents a clearly articulated (new institutionalist) framework, incorporating a range of independent variables, to explain differential outcomes.

Like Schmidt, the Caporaso *et al.* and the Knill and Lehmkuhl studies each draw heavily on ‘new institutionalist’ arguments. These need to be distinguished in order to clarify the framework of analysis (Hall and Taylor 1996). The first aspect is that each study examines ‘*the goodness of fit*’, between EU-level processes, policies, and institutions and those found at the domestic level. The second aspect of new institutionalism that is relevant here is the notion of there being two ‘logics’ in the operation of institutions. This notion is based on the now classic study of March and Olsen (1984, 1989). They posited a ‘*logic of appropriateness*’, in which institutions affect actor behaviour by the latter internalizing the norms of the institution and developing identities that are compatible with it. In other words, actors develop a commitment to the institution or are persuaded of the legitimacy of its claims. A second logic—of ‘*consequentialism*’—affects the opportunities and constraints of actors within institutions; in other words, the distribution of power. Each of these aspects has been very influential in the elaboration of ‘Europeanization’ processes.

In this volume, Börzel and Risse begin with the ‘goodness of fit’ notion and seek to combine the two logics of March and Olsen. The logic of appropriateness, and the processes of persuasion, is placed within the sociological

institutionalist approach. The logic of consequentialism, dealing with differential empowerment, is placed within 'rationalist institutionalism', drawing on rational choice precepts. The core of their argument is that the two logics of March and Olsen are not incompatible. This is a distinctive position to adopt: ideas and interests normally give rise to separate frameworks. They argue—rather persuasively—that both logics often occur simultaneously or they characterize different phases of the Europeanization process. Moreover, the impact of Europeanization is differential across policies, polities, and politics. The determining factors of the two logics differ, however: the logic of appropriateness depends on the activities of norm entrepreneurs and the nature of political culture; the logic of consequentialism rests on the existence of multiple veto points and the distribution of institutional resources between actors.

Other contributions in this volume question the interpretation of 'goodness of fit' in relation to adaptational pressure. Haverland argues that even with a misfit at the domestic level, other conditions must exist before shifts occur. Government reluctance to implement the appropriate policy changes may not be due to lack of will, but rather the result of being held back by domestic veto points. The argument refines the understanding of the strategic dilemmas faced by governments. Indeed, it would be fruitful to enrich the analytical framework further, by disaggregating 'government' into distinct actors. Börzel and Risse in this volume acknowledge that 'misfit' is a necessary, but not a sufficient, condition of domestic change. Moreover, in a crucial qualification to their framework they note that 'goodness of fit' is not a static phenomenon. This is important in that both the institutional settings of the European Union and of the member states are evolving, not fixed, and the task is to show the reciprocal effects on each.

Radaelli offers a more fulsome critique, noting the limits to the application of the 'goodness of fit' perspective, developing a similar point made by Knill and Lehmkuhl. 'Goodness of fit' is relevant when an EU model exists to be implemented. However, the impact of the EU can be felt via softer mechanisms and others, such as regulatory competition. Radaelli highlights several types of cases. First, with respect to 'negative integration' (the removal of internal market barriers), the stimulus to change is not the 'goodness of fit' between domestic and the EU commitments, but rather regulatory competition, for example, as a result of mutual recognition. Second, in policy areas like that of railways, the European Union has developed minimalist directives or non-compulsory regulations, which do not themselves create adaptational pressure, but may prepare the ground for major cognitive shifts in the domestic policy debate. Innovations in regulatory policy affected national debates on media ownership policy. Third, the European Union can affect national policy by creating policy forums and socialization processes that lead to cognitive convergence. Radaelli develops his argument further: the 'goodness of

fit' notion must be qualified according to the type of domestic institutional setting that exists, taking account of strong/weak institutional differences, the institutional conditions that can resist or be thwarted by EU impacts.

It is tempting to see Radaelli's contribution as a refinement of the 'goodness of fit' perspective, rather than a refutation. It extends the understanding of how EU developments can be transmitted into domestic politics and it focuses attention on the need to differentiate institutional settings. It is a much subtler elaboration of the mechanisms of Europeanization operating in public policy processes. The two logics of appropriateness and of consequentialism remain valid: they should not be seen in a narrow, mechanistic sense. Moreover, as noted earlier, the role of structure and agency in the Europeanization process is mutually constitutive.

### **'Europeanization' as a research agenda**

The chapter by Börzel and Risse in this volume ably outlines a general analytical framework for investigating the ramifications of Europeanization in terms of the domestic institutional setting. By extension, 'Europeanization' entails absorption, accommodation, and transformation of this setting in response to the demands of EU membership. Their incorporation of rationalist and sociological institutionalism leads them to combine a stress on actor interests and ideas, following the two logics of consequentialism and appropriateness. It is important, though, not to neglect the norms, rules, and procedures highlighted by the historical institutionalist perspective (Pierson 1996). Moreover, the Börzel and Risse formulation essentially provides an outline of potential mechanisms: the research task is to evaluate the significance of the different components of their framework in particular cases.

The design of the present volume reflects a sense that this perspective, broad as it already is, does not capture all the major features of how the EU affects member states. In particular, it may not be the best starting point for the study of how the EU impacts upon policies and policy processes. Here, Radaelli offers an alternative and insightful definition. 'Europeanization', he writes, consists of

processes of (a) construction (b) diffusion and (c) institutionalization of formal and informal rules, procedures, policy paradigms, styles, 'ways of doing things', and shared beliefs and norms which are first defined and consolidated in the EU policy process and then incorporated in the logic of domestic (national and subnational) discourse, political structures, and public policies.

The stress here on construction, diffusion, and institutionalization is itself wide-ranging. Some operational issues arise here. The emphasis on phenomena

that are first set at the EU level and then impact domestically begs a ‘chicken and egg’ question: which comes first? Or, who is affecting whom? It may also not adequately reflect the emergence of cross-national policy networks that are not directly ‘defined and consolidated in the EU policy process’. Finally, the ‘logic of... discourse, structures and policies’ remains somewhat ambiguous—‘logic’ here needs careful definition—and gives less emphasis to actors themselves. Yet, the prime advantage of Radaelli’s conceptualization is that it fills some of the gaps left in the Börzel and Risse formulation—notably, in the treatment of the policy process—whilst it overlaps in other areas. Mörth in her contribution to this volume extends the coverage of Europeanization of public policy, by delineating processes of ‘interpretation, translation, and editing’ at the domestic level.

The two formulations—of, crudely, institutional settings and policy processes—are well grounded in the wider political science literature. Nevertheless, breadth and specificity are difficult bedfellows in this context. Authors working with other meta-theoretical frames would give more emphasis than either provides explicitly to the impact of the EU on the processes of central government administration, on subnational authorities (multilevel governance), and on policy networks. Later chapters in this volume do precisely that. Kassim investigates how national governments have sought to coordinate their EU policy at home, to be more effective at the EU level. Goldsmith’s chapter addresses the impact of EU membership on regional and local governments.

More generally, the chapter by Grabbe makes the point that Europeanization effects are felt beyond the current member states. The so-called ‘preaccession states’ of central Europe have already experienced the impact of EU regulation, financial incentive, monitoring, political participation, and the like. Often the relationship between the EU and the applicant states can appear akin to that of David and Goliath, albeit with the former having no effective sling in this case. The contrast can be most stark for the microstates seeking EU entry (Cyprus, Malta). Featherstone (2000) examined the onset of ‘Europeanization’ for Cyprus, noting the extent of domestic structural transformation and government adaptation. A distinctive feature in this case is the strategic usage of the planned accession by the Cyprus Government to gain advantage over Turkey and its pariah ‘statelet’, the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus. The external dimension of ‘Europeanization’ is of major and continuing significance, but to encapsulate both this and the internal dimension in a single formulation is problematic.

Fundamentally, contrasts of this type affirm the relevance of examining the asymmetries of ‘Europeanization’ across settings, be it national or policy sector. Patterns may exist in national responses to ‘Europeanisation’, according to shared state characteristics. The studies contained in the volume by

Featherstone and Kazamias (2000) analyse the patterns of ‘Europeanization’ in southern Europe, noting likely core–periphery differences. Later contributions in the present volume investigate the nature of ‘Europeanization’ in specific and varied policy sectors. Haverland reflects on the state of current knowledge of the impact of the EU on environmental policies; Harcourt discusses the processes through which the EU has become a major actor in shaping national media regulation; and Wincott considers the role of the EU in shaping domestic social policies, in a context of competing international pressures on the state’s regulatory capacity. An alternative lens by which to view sector impacts is that of gauging the response of interest groups to ‘Europeanization’. The two chapters by Grote and Schneider and by Coen and Danreuther examine how the European Union has affected business groups in EU processes. Together, these chapters provide a rich empirical base on which to draw out key features of the ‘Europeanization’ process. This is a task taken up by Featherstone and Radaelli in the conclusion to this volume.

### **Conclusion: The Utility of ‘Europeanization’**

Why use the term ‘Europeanization’? The foregoing survey has highlighted the range of usage, the complex ontology, and the problems of research design inherent in the study of ‘Europeanization’. Against this background, the utility of ‘Europeanization’ as a term in political science may be questioned. Yet, by using ‘Europeanization’, the researcher can provide a gateway to developments across the continent that are both current and complex. It is precisely the breadth of application and the demanding explanatory framework needed that attests to the value and importance of the term. The contemporary reality of asymmetrical patterns of absorption, accommodation, and transformation—to use the Börzel and Risse outline of institutional impacts in response to pressures emanating within the dynamics of EU integration—requires careful investigation. Crucially, as is evident from the works discussed above, such developments necessitate two prime types of innovation: first, the revision and/or synthesis of existing conceptual frameworks in political science and international relations; and, second, an empirical focus that cuts across traditional analytical dimensions (European, national, subnational, etc.). As a term for such innovation, ‘Europeanization’ acknowledges the dynamism, imbroglia, and limits to determinism in present-day Europe.

In this context, ‘Europeanization’ as an analytical focus stresses key changes in contemporary politics. Most notably, it highlights the:

- adaptation of institutional settings in the broadest sense (of rules, procedures, norms, practices) at different political levels in response to the dynamics of integration;

- role of the preaccession process in the continued democratization and ‘marketization’ of central Europe;
- emergence of new, cross-national policy networks and communities;
- nature of policy mimicry and transfer between states and subnational authorities;
- shifts in cognition, discourse, and identity affecting policy in response to European developments;
- restructuring of the strategic opportunities available to domestic actors, as EU commitments, having a differential impact on such actors, may serve as a source of leverage.

Such foci create a challenging research agenda and the chapters in this volume address many of the key questions that arise:

- How does Europeanization affect the interests and ideas, actors and institutions within the European Union? As noted here, the chapter by Börzel and Risse and that by Radaelli develop competing arguments on these questions.
- What is the impact of the European Union on policy processes?
- How significant is transnational learning in policy processes?
- Can we delineate how actors in different national settings ‘translate’ and ‘edit’ EU policy obligations?
- Why does adaptational pressure lead to policy convergence between states in some sectors, but not in others?

Radaelli provides a general analytical framework for this discussion, and more specific issues are examined in the empirical case studies provided in the chapters by Harcourt, Haverland, Mörth, and Wincott.

- What is the impact of the European Union on institutions and modes of governance?
- Are EU pressures prompting states to manage and coordinate their EU policies in a similar fashion?
- What is the impact of Europeanization on subnational authorities?
- How have interest groups responded to the new forms of EU politics?
- Are the impacts of the European Union in Central Europe comparable to those in existing member states?

These issues are taken up in the chapters by Kassim; Goldsmith; Grote and Schneider; Coen and Danreuther; and Grabbe.

The discussions that follow provide a convincing argument that the study of ‘Europeanization’ is central to an understanding of the contemporary politics of the continent, as Europe faces the new challenges of the twenty-first century.

## REFERENCES

- Abraham, J. and Lewis, G. (1999). 'Harmonizing and Competing for Medicines Regulation: How Healthy are the European Union's Systems of Drug Approval?' *Social Science and Medicine* 48(11): 1655–67.
- Agh, A. (1999a). 'Europeanization of Policy-Making in East Central Europe: The Hungarian Approach to EU Accession', *Journal of European Public Policy* 6(5): 839–54.
- (1999b). 'Processes of Democratization in the East Central European and Balkan States: Sovereignty Related Conflicts in the Context of Europeanization', *Government and Post-Communist Studies* 32(3): 263–79.
- Allen, D. (1998). 'Who Speaks for Europe? The Search for an Effective and Coherent External Policy', in J. Peterson and M. Sjurgen (eds), *A Common Foreign Policy for Europe? Competing Visions of CFSP* (London: Routledge), 44–58.
- Andersen, S. S. (1995). 'Europeanization of Policy Making' *Tidsskrift for Samfunnsforskning* 36(4): 495–518.
- and Eliassen, K. A. (1993) (eds). *Making Policy in Europe: The Europeification of National Policy-Making* (London: Sage).
- Benington, J. and Taylor M. (1993). 'Changes and Challenges Facing the UK Welfare State in the Europe of the 1990s', *Policy and Politics* 21(2): 121–34.
- Bennett, C. (1991). 'Review Article: What Is Policy Convergence and What Causes It?' *British Journal of Political Science* 21: 215–33.
- Benoit, B., Keeler, J. T. S., and Schain, M. A. (1997). 'Chirac's Challenge: Liberalization, Europeanization and Malaise in France', *Millenium Journal of International Studies* 26(2): 555–7.
- Bhaskar, R. (1979). *The Possibility of Naturalism* (Brighton: Harvester).
- Borneman, J. and Fowler, N. (1997). 'Europeanization' *Annual Review of Anthropology* 26: 487–514.
- Bulmer, S. and Burch, M. (1998). 'Organizing for Europe: Whitehall, the British State and European Union', *Public Administration* 76, Winter, 601–28.
- (2001). 'The "Europeanisation" of Central Government: The UK and Germany in Historical Institutional Perspective', in G. Schneider and M. Aspinwall (eds), *The Rules of Integration: Institutional Approaches to the Study of Europe* (Manchester: Manchester University Press).
- Caporaso (1996). 'The European Union and Forms of State: Westphalian, Regulatory or Post-Modern?' *Journal of Common Market Studies* 34(1): 29–52.
- Checkel, J. (1997). 'International Norms and Domestic Politics: Bridging the Rationalist-constructivist Divide', *European Journal of International Relations* 3: 473–95.
- (1998). 'The Constructivist Turn in International Relations Theory', *World Politics* 50(2): 324–48.
- (1999). 'Social Construction and Integration', *Journal of European Public Policy* 6(4): 545–60.
- Cesnys, G. (1991). 'The Neolithic and Bronze-Age Man in South-East Baltic Area', *Homo* 42(3): 232–43.
- Chapman, M. and Murie, A. (1996). 'Housing and the European Union', *Housing Studies* 11(2): 307–18.

- Charles, D. and Albright, D. (1984). 'Europeanization of NATO', *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists* 40(9): 45–6.
- Cole, A. (2001). 'National and Partisan Contexts of Europeanisation', *Journal of Common Market Studies* 39(1): 15–36.
- Daniels, P. (1998). 'From Hostility to "Constructive Engagement": The Europeanisation of the Labour Party', *West European Politics* 21(1): 72–96.
- Diamandouros, N. (1994). 'Cultural Dualism and Political Change in Post-Authoritarian Greece', *Estudios-Working Papers* 50, Madrid: Centro de Estudios Avanzados en Ciencias Sociales.
- Dineen, D. A. (1992). 'Europeanization of Irish Universities', *Higher Education* 24(3): 391–411.
- Doogan, K. (1992). 'The Social Charter and the Europeanization of Employment and Social Policy', *Policy and Politics* 20(3): 167–76.
- Dyson, K. and Featherstone, K. (1996). 'Italy and EMU as a "Vincolo Esterno": Empowering the Technocrats, Transforming the State', *South European Society and Politics* 1(2): 272–99.
- (1999). *The Road to Maastricht: Negotiating Economic and Monetary Union* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- Eberlein, B. (1997). 'The Decline of French Statism: The Case of Research and Technology Policy', *Politische Vierteljahresschrift* 38(3): 441–86.
- Featherstone, K. (1998). '"Europeanization" and the Centre Periphery: The Case of Greece in the 1990s', *South European Society and Politics* 3(1): 23–39.
- (2000). 'Cyprus and the Onset of Europeanization: Strategic Usage, Structural Transformation and Institutional Adaptation', *South European Society and Politics* 5(2): 141–65.
- and Kazamias, G. (2000). *Europeanization and the Southern Periphery* (London: Frank Cass). Also published as special issue of *South European Society and Politics*.
- and Papadimitriou, D. (2000). 'Greece and the Negotiation of Economic and Monetary Union: Preferences, Strategies, and Institutions', *Journal of Modern Greek Studies* 18: 393–414.
- Featherstone, K. Kazamias, G. and Papadimitriou, D. (2001). 'The Limits of External Empowerment: Greece, EMU and Pension Reform', *Political Studies* 49: 462–80.
- Finkhafner, D. (1998). 'Organized Interests in the Policy-making Process in Slovenia', *Journal of European Public Policy* 5(2): 285–302.
- Garrett, G. and Tsebelis, G. (1996). 'An Institutional Critique of Intergovernmentalism', *International Organization* 50: 269–300.
- Giddens, A. (1984). *The Constitution of Society* (Cambridge: Polity Press).
- Giuliani, M. (2000). 'Europeanization and Italy: A Bottom-Up Process?' *South European Society and Politics* 5(2): 47–72.
- Goetz, K. (1995). 'National Governance and European Integration: Inter-Governmental Relations in Germany', *Journal of Common Market Studies* 33(1): 91–116.
- (2000). 'European Integration and National Executives: A Cause in Search of an Effect?' *West European Politics* 23(4): 211–40.
- and Hix, S. (2000). 'Introduction: European Integration and National Political Systems', *West European Politics*, special issue 'Europeanised Politics? European Integration and National Political Systems', 23(4) (Oct.).

- Goldsmith, M. (1993). 'The Europeanisation of Local Government', *Urban Studies* 30(4/5): 683–99.
- and Klausen, K. (1997) (eds). *European Integration and Local Government* (Cheltenham: Edward Elgar).
- and Sperling, E. (1997). 'Local Governments and the EU: The British Experience', in Goldsmith and Klausen (eds).
- Gourevitch, P. (1986). *Politics in Hard Times: Comparative Responses to International Economic Crises* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press).
- Grande, E. (1995). 'Das Paradox der Schwäche, Forschungspolitik und die Einflusslogik europäischer Politikverflechtung' [The Paradox of Weakness: Research Policy and the Logic of Influence of Interlinked European Politics], in M. Jachtenfuchs and B. Kohler-Koch (eds), *Europäische Integration [European Integration]* (Opladen: Leske and Budrich).
- Gransow, V. (1982). 'The End of the Ideological Age: The Europeanization of Europe', *Argument* 24(Mar.): 299–300.
- Groux, G., Mouriaux, R. and Pernot, J.M. (1993). 'L'eupéanisation du mouvement syndical: la confédération, européenne des syndicats': *Mouvement Social*, 162, 41–67.
- Haas, E. B. (1958). *The Uniting of Europe: Political, Social and Economic Forces 1950–57* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press).
- Hall, P. and Taylor, R. (1996). 'Political Science and the Three New Institutionalisms', *Political Studies* 44: 936–57.
- Hanf, K. and Soetendorp, B. (1998). *Adapting to European Integration: Small States and the European Union* (London: Longman).
- Harmsen, R. (1999). 'The Europeanization of National Administrations: A Comparative Study of France and the Netherlands'. *Governance* 12(1): 81–113.
- Heimann, G. (1990). 'The Weakening of Blocks and the Europeanization of Germany', *Europa Archiv* 45(5): 167–72.
- Hennis, M. (2001). 'Europeanization and Globalization', *Journal of Common Market Studies* 39(5): 829–50.
- Héritier, A. and Knill, C. (2000). 'Differential Responses to European Policies: a Comparison', *Max Planck Projektgruppe Recht der Gemeinschaftsgüter Preprint 2000–3*, Bonn.
- Holden, R. (1999). 'Labour's Transformation: Searching for the Point of Origin—the European dynamic', *Politics* 19(2): 103–8.
- John, P. (1996). 'Europeanisation in a Centralising State: Multi-Level Governance in the U.K.', *Regional and Federal Studies* 6(2).
- and LeGalès, P. (1997). 'Is the Grass Greener on the Other Side? What Went Wrong with French Regions, and the Implications for England', *Policy and Politics* 25(1): 51–60.
- and Whitehead, A. (1997). 'The Renaissance of English Regionalism in the 1990s', *Policy and Politics* 25(1): 7–17.
- Joppke, C. (1995). 'Toward a New Sociology of the State: On Brubaker, Roger', *Archives Europeennes de Sociologie* 36(1): 168–78.
- Jordan, A. (1998). 'Private Affluence and Public Squalor? The Europeanization of British Coastal Bathing Water Policy', *Policy and Politics* 26(1): 33–54.

- Jorgensen, T. B. (1999). 'The Public Sector in an In-Between Time: Searching for New Public Values', *Public Administration* 77(3): 565–84.
- Kazan, I. and Waever, O. (1994). 'Turkey between Europe and Europeanization', *Internasjonal Politikk* 52(2): 139–75.
- Keatinge, P. (1983). 'European Political Cooperation: Towards a Foreign Policy for Europe', *Journal of Common Market Studies* 21(3).
- Kerr, H. (1973). 'Changing Attitudes Through International Participation: European Parliamentarians and Integration', *International Organization* 27: 45–83.
- Knill, C. and Lehmkuhl, D. (1999). 'How Europe Matters: Different Mechanisms of Europeanization', *European Integration Online Papers* 3(7).
- Knutsen, B. O. (1996). 'The Europeanization of NATO and a Common European Defence Policy', *Internasjonal Politikk* 54(4): 501–26.
- Kohler-Koch, B. and Eising, R. (eds) (1999). *The Transformation of Governance in the European Union* (London: Routledge).
- Kohout, J. (1999). 'On Patocka's Philosophy on History', *Filosoficky Casopis* 47(1): 97–103.
- Ladrech, R. (1994). 'The Europeanization of Domestic Politics and Institutions: The Case of France', *Journal of Common Market Studies* 32(1): 69–88.
- Lawton, T. (1999). 'Governing the Skies: Conditions for the Europeanisation of Airline Policy', *Journal of Public Policy* 19(1): 91–112.
- Lecher, W. and Rub, S. (1999). 'The Constitution of European Works Councils: From Information Forum to Social Actor?' *European Journal of Industrial Relations* 5(1): 7–25.
- Levitsky, J. E. (1994). 'The Europeanization of the British Legal Style', *American Journal of Comparative Law* 42(2): 347–80.
- Maguire, J., Poulton, E., and Possamai, C. (1999). 'The War of the Words? Identity Politics in Anglo-German Press Coverage of EURO '96', *European Journal of Communication* 14(1): 61–89.
- Mair, P. (2000). 'The Limited Impact of Europe on National Party Systems', *West European Politics* 23(4): 27–51.
- Mangen, S. (1996). 'The Europeanization of Spanish Social Policy', *Social Policy and Administration* 30(4): 305–23.
- Manners, I. and Whitman, R. G. (2000). (eds), *The Foreign Policies of the European Union Member States* (Manchester: Manchester University Press).
- March, J. and Olsen, J. P. (1984). 'The New Institutionalism: Organizational Factors in Political Life', *American Political Science Review* 78(3): 734–49.
- (1989). *Rediscovering Institutions: The Organizational Basis of Politics* (New York: The Free Press).
- (1995). *Democratic Governance* (New York: Free Press).
- Marks, G. (1993). 'Structural Policy and Multilevel Governance in the EC', in A. Cafruny and G. Rosenthal (eds) *The State of the European Community II: The Maastricht Debates and Beyond* (Boulder: Lynne Rienner).
- (1996). 'An Actor-Centred Approach to Multi-Level Governance', *Regional and Federal Studies* 6(2): Summer, 20–38.
- Martin, S. (1993). 'The Europeanization of Local Authorities: Challenges for Rural Areas', *Journal for Rural Studies* 9(2): 153–61.

- Mazey, S. (1998). 'The European Union and Women's Rights: From the Europeanization of National Agendas to the Nationalization of a European Agenda?' *Journal of European Public Policy* 5(1): 131–52.
- Mény, Y. (1996). 'Introduction', in Y. Mény, P. Muller, and J-L. Quermonne (eds), *Adjusting to Europe: The Impact of the European Union on National Institutions and Policies* (London: Routledge).
- Muller, P., and Quermonne, J. L. (1996). *Adjusting to Europe: The Impact of the European Union on National Institutions and Policies* (London: Routledge).
- Mjoset, L. (1997). 'The Historical Meanings of Europeanization', *Arena Working Paper* 24 (Oslo: University of Oslo).
- Moravcsik, A. (1994). 'Why the European Community Strengthens the State: Domestic Politics and International Cooperation', *Center for European Studies Working Paper* 52 (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University).
- Nilson, H. R. (1993). 'European Integration and Environmental Cooperation in the Barents Region: The Baltic Sea Cooperation—A Model for Europeanization', *Internasjonal Politikk* 51(2): 185–98.
- Olafsdottir, H., Gudmundsdottir, A., and Asmundsson, G. (1997). 'The Europeanization of Drinking Habits in Iceland after the Legalization of Beer', *European Addiction Research* 3(2): 59–66.
- Olsen, J. P. (1996). 'Europeanization and Nation-state Dynamics', in S. Gustavsson and L. Lewin (eds), *The Future of the Nation-State* (Stockholm: Nerenius and Santérus Publishers).
- (2002). 'The Many Faces of Europeanization', *Arena Working Papers*, 01/2, Oslo.
- Pamir, M. (1994). 'Turkey between Europe and Europeanization', *Internasjonal Politikk* 52(2): 177–9.
- Peterson, J. and Bomberg, E. (2000). *Decision-Making in the European Union* (London: Macmillan).
- Pierson, P. (1996). 'The Path to European Integration: A Historical Institutional Analysis', *Comparative Political Studies* 29: 123–63.
- Poruciuc, A. (1992). 'Problems and Patterns of the Southeast European Ethnogenesis and Glottgenesis (c.6500BC–AD1500)', *Mankind Quarterly* 33(1): 3–41.
- Putnam, R. (1988). 'Diplomacy and Domestic Politics: The Logic of Two-Level Games', *International Organization* 42: 427–60.
- Radaelli, C. (1997). 'How Does Europeanization Produce Domestic Policy Change? Corporate Tax Policy in Italy and the United Kingdom', *Comparative Political Studies* 30(5): 553–75.
- Rhodes, R. A. W., Bache, I., and George, S. (1996). 'Policy Networks and Policy Making in the European Union: A Critical Appraisal', in L. Hooghe (ed.), *Cohesion Policy and European Integration* (Oxford: Clarendon Press), 367–87.
- Risse, T., Caporaso, J., and Green Cowles, M. (2001). 'Introduction', in M. Green Cowles, J. Caporaso and T. Risse (eds), *Transforming Europe: Europeanization and Domestic Change* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell U.P.).
- Rometsch, R. and Wessels, W. (eds) (1996). *The European Union and Member States: Towards Institutional Fusion?* (Manchester: Manchester University Press).

- Rothstein, H., Irwin, A., Yearley, S., and McCarthy, E. (1999). 'Regulatory Science, Europeanization and the Control of Agrochemicals', *Science Technology and Human Values* 24(2): 241–64.
- Sabatier, P. (1998). 'The Advocacy Coalition Framework: Revisions and Relevance for Europe', *Journal of European Public Policy* 5(1): 98–130.
- Saeter, M. (1984). 'Germany in European Politics: East–West Confrontation or Europeanization?', *Internasjonal Politikk* SIS2: 63–91.
- Salih, MAM (1989). 'The Europeanization of War in Africa: From Traditional to Modern Warfare', *Current Research on Peace and Violence* 12(1): 27–37.
- Scharpf, F. (1988). 'The Joint-Decision Trap: Lessons from German Federalism and European Integration', *Public Administration* 66(3): 239–78.
- (1997). *Games Real Actors Play* (Boulder, Col.: Westview Press).
- Schmidt, V. A. (1997). 'Discourse and (Dis)integration in Europe: The Cases of France, Germany and Great Britain', *Daedalus* 126(3): 167–99.
- (2001). 'The Politics of Economic Adjustment in France and Britain: When does Discourse Matter?'. *Journal of European Public Policy* 8(2): 247–64.
- (2002). 'Europeanization and the Mechanics of Economic Policy Adjustment', *Journal of European Public Policy*, forthcoming.
- Schoen, D. and Rein, M. (1994). *Frame Reflection* (New York: Basic Books).
- Seitter, W. (1993). 'Adult Education between Europeanization and National Traditions', *Zeitschrift fur Padagogik* 39(3): 427–42.
- Smith, M. E. (2000). 'Conforming to Europe: The Domestic Impact of EU Foreign Policy Co-operation', *Journal of European Public Policy* 7(4).
- Soysal, Y. (1994). *Limits of Citizenship: Migrants and Postnational Membership in Europe* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press).
- Tarrow, S. (1994). *Power in Movement: Social Movements, Collective Action and Politics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Torreblanca, J. I. (2001). 'Ideas, Preferences and Institutions: Explaining the Europeanization of Spanish Foreign Policy', *Arena Working Papers*, Oslo, 01/26.
- Tsebelis, G. (1990). *Nested Games: Rational Choice in Comparative Politics* (Berkeley: University of California Press).
- (1994). 'The Power of the European Parliament as a Conditional Agenda-setter', *American Political Science Review* 88: 128–42.
- (1995). 'Conditional Agenda Setting and Decision Making Inside the European Parliament', *Journal of Legislative Studies* 1: 65–93.
- Turner, L. (1996). 'The Europeanization of Labour: Structure before Action', *European Journal of Industrial Relations* 2(3): 325–44.
- Venturelli, S. S. (1993). 'The Imagined Transnational Public Sphere in the European Community Broadcast Philosophy: Implications for Democracy', *European Journal of Communication* 8(4): 491–518.
- Yost, D. S. (1996). 'France's Nuclear Dilemmas', *Foreign Affairs* 75(1): 108–20.
- Wallace, W. (1994). 'Rescue or Retreat: The Nation State in Western Europe, 1945–1993', *Political Studies* 42: 52–76.
- Wessels, W. (1998). 'Comitology: Fusion in Action—Politico-Administrative Trends in the EU System', *Journal of European Public Policy* 5(2): 209–34.