Research Repository UCD

Provided by the author(s) and University College Dublin Library in accordance with publisher policies. Please cite the published version when available.

Title	Europeanization
Authors(s)	Tonra, Ben
Publication date	2015-06
Publication information	Jorgensen, K.E., Aarstad, A.K., Drieskens, E., Laatikainen, K. and Tonra, B. (eds.). SAGE Handbook of European Foreign Policy
Publisher	Sage Publications
Link to online version	https://uk.sagepub.com/en-gb/eur/the-sage-handbook-of-european-foreign-policy/book241829
Item record/more information	http://hdl.handle.net/10197/7303

Downloaded 2022-06-28T10:28:19Z

The UCD community has made this article openly available. Please share how this access benefits you. Your story matters! (@ucd_oa)

© Some rights reserved. For more information, please see the item record link above.

12

Europeanization

Ben Tonra

There is no doubt that the concept of Europeanization as applied to EU foreign policy has a growing academic profile. A rudimentary search of Google Scholar, for example, reveals that the concept, linked to foreign policy, was cited in just over 200 scholarly publications in 2000, in 800 such publications by 2005 and over 1,800 academic publications in 2013. However, this very growth has led to criticism. Europeanization has been censured as the poster child for concept-stretching (Radaelli, 2000), as being poorly and confusingly defined (Mair, 2004) and for having limited explanatory capacity, either by reason of lacking parsimony in its measurement (Lodge, 2006) or as a result of confusion over its causal status (Wong and Hill, 2011). These concerns result in the worst possible scholarly criticism – that Europeanization is simply an academic fad, devoid of substantial conceptual utility (Olsen, 2003; Moumoutzis, 2011).

In a sense, the overarching concept of Europeanization has an almost classic genealogy. Initially it was adopted from a broader literature (for reviews see Harmsen and Wilson, 2000; Olson, 2002; Graziano and Vink, 2007; and Marciacq, 2012) and was employed to fill a gap in our understanding of/explanation for the shape and impact of European integration. It was an 'attention-directing device', according to Olsen (2002: 921). This resulted in a somewhat scattergun application of the concept and sometimes even in contradictory contexts, which provoked demands for greater clarity of definition and precision in method and application. It may now be argued, however, that the concept has indeed come of age, with generally acknowledged core definition(s), wide agreement on method and approach and a broadened empirical application deployed to test its added value. Europeanization may thus today be seen as a comparatively stable middle-range theory that offers a useful analytical framework for both the study of changes wrought in national foreign policy as a result of EU membership and for the creation and pursuit of a common EU foreign policy.

The three interconnected processes through which this process is frequently seen to derive are uploading, downloading and cross-loading. The first considers how, when and to what end national foreign-policy preferences are brought to the European table and pursued using the EU as a means of amplifying national foreign policy – standing on the shoulders, as it were, of European partners. The second, downloading, is a process by which it is said hard-fought, collectively agreed EU policy positions embed themselves within national foreign policies and institutions over time and become part of the warp and weave of that policy. What has come to be known as cross-loading – perhaps the least developed process – is where member states learn from one another in terms of information, analysis and even policymaking structures.

The shape of the debate(s) surrounding Europeanization has revolved around its definition and its application to the realm of foreign policy. Traditional integration theories were seen to offer explanations for the construction of European-level institutions and polity-building. There was also an interest in the influence of these institutions and how their policymaking impacted member states. While the concept of Europeanization was itself briefly associated with the development of European-level governance structures and networks (Risse et al., 2001) it soon became 'concerned with the consequences of this process for … the member states' (Bulmer and Lequesne, 2002: 16). This move also represented something of a reassertion of political science in the study of European integration *vis-à-vis* international relations (IR), from where most traditional integration theories derived. In the words of Bulmer and Radaelli, 'Having spent intellectual energy in seeking to understand the "nature of the beast", that is, the nature of European integration, political scientists have now realized that a EU political system is in place, produces decisions, and impacts on domestic policies in various guises' (2004: 3). Europeanization has also been seen in many quarters as part of the institutionalist turn in political science (Aspinwall and Schneider, 2000; Hix and Goetz, 2000; Börzel and Risse, 2000) through which political institutions are understood to affect political outcomes. This may be accomplished through a variety of means (rationalist, historical, sociological, discursive) but, individually or in tandem, it is argued that they structure political action and its outcomes.

The early focus of much of the original scholarship on Europeanization was on those areas of policy where the impact of European integration was most visible and where member states clearly had to adapt themselves to European policy, practice, legislation and norms – embodied in the notion of the European *acquis* and rooted within traditional areas of European policy and legal competence. From Ladrech's (1994) core definition that Europeanization was 'an incremental process reorienting the direction and shape of politics to the degree that EC political and economic dynamics become part of the organisational logic of national logic of national politics and policy-making', studies in policy areas such as agriculture, cohesion policy, the environment, transportation and financial services (for examples see Knill, 2001; Checkel, 2001; Lawton, 1999; Howell, 2004; Geddes, 2003; Levi-Faur, 2002) developed a model of top-down Europeanization. In such studies the fit between national and European policy was assessed and any misfit could then be judged in terms of the extent to which states had to adapt. This resulted in identifying varying degrees of domestic institutional and political change (Börzel, 2003; Risse, et al. 2001: 7).

Europeanization has also been considered and applied to non-member states, both those with and those without the prospect of EU membership. The most obvious is the Europeanization undertaken by states approaching EU membership. This is comparable with that outlined above but is nonetheless distinctive. In the context of the 2004 enlargement Adrienne Héritier (2005) dubbed this 'Europeanization East', where states faced adaptation requirements to an entire corpus of

existing EU law and norms and had very limited capacity to tailor or to influence the nature or scale of that adaptation. This subset of the literature has focused closely upon the models and mechanisms by which such states adopt EU rules (Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier, 2005) and has been applied to most applicant states. For its part, the Europeanization of states with little or no prospect of EU membership is commonly a process that impacts upon other European states with a close and often institutionalized relationship with the EU, such as Norway, Switzerland and Iceland (see, for example, Kux and Sverdrup 2000; Lægreid et al., 2004). Beyond this point, however, we can perhaps better consider such processes within the context of EU policy on enlargement (see Chapter 59, this volume), towards the EU's geographic neighbours (see Chapter 60, this volume) and in efforts to export norms and policies on a thematic basis internationally (see Chapter xx, this volume).

AQ: Please insert Chapter number here.

EUROPEANIZATION OF FOREIGN POLICY

At first glance the prospects for the application of the concept of Europeanization to the realm of national foreign policy in the early European Communities (EC) were not propitious. This was a policy area strictly reserved for intergovernmental decision-making, from which the core supranational European institutions were either wholly excluded or with which they were only loosely associated, and which often resulted in vague policy agreements that were never legally binding on member states and resulted in little or no legislation.

The *entrée* to Europeanization for some analysts of foreign policy was to be found in the framing of beliefs, informal norms and rules and ideational issues that had been identified as a subset of the wider process of Europeanization (Radaelli, 2000). In addition, the misfit model identified above included scope for the study not just of top-down adaptation but of bottom-up engagement, where member states sought to project their own policy preferences on to the European agenda (Börzel, 2003; Bulmer and Burch, 2001; Risse et al., 2001). This clearly offered at least some potential in the foreign-policy realm, where member states sought to export their policy preferences, albeit through intergovernmental means of consultation and cooperation. The Europeanization literature also provided for the analysis not just of policy misfit, where member states had to adapt themselves to legally binding legislation, but also of institutional misfit, where, through intensive and shared institutional practice and procedure, key policy actors might be socialized and thereby begin to share a common set of beliefs and expectations (Schmidt, 2002; Bulmer, 2007; Checkel, 2001). This aspect was critical to the deployment of Radaelli's widely cited definition of Europeanization as consisting of 'processes of a) construction, b) diffusion and c) institutionalisation 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 sub national) discourse, political structures and public policies'. (2004:3)

The earliest studies of Europeanization as applied to foreign-policy cooperation among EC member states built upon an already existing corpus of scholarship dealing with comparable issues to those being tackled under the rubric of Europeanization. Questions as to whether European integration was empowering the European state (Moravcsik, 1993), hollowing out the state (Marks, 1993) or transforming the state (Kohler-Koch, 1996) were already being asked. This conversation was mirrored in a small number of pioneering analyses of foreign-policy cooperation which argued that this process represented 'the European rescue of national foreign policy' (Allen, 1996, *pace* Milward, 1992), that 'a distinctive European position in international affairs' was developing (Hill, 1983: 200), that a 'coordination reflex' had emerged among

European foreign-policy actors (Nuttall, 1992), that a new European 'Diplomatic Republic' was coming into view (Jørgensen, 1997), that foreign-policy cooperation was progressively constructing 'communities' of information, views and actions (de Schoutheete, 1986) and that the 'Brusselsization' (Allen, 1998; Mueller-Brandeck-Bocquet, 2002) and/or 'Europeification' (Andersen and Eliasen, 1995) of national foreign policies was already underway.

Notwithstanding this foundation of scholarship, a case had to be constructed for what looked like the very special case of foreign policy within the Europeanization literature. First, as noted above, there was only limited applicability of the broader conceptual model. Within Bulmer and Radaelli's outline of four modes of governance leading to different mechanisms of Europeanization,[1] foreign policy could only reasonably be accommodated within 'facilitated coordination', comprising policy exchange and soft law (Bulmer and Radaelli, 2004). While this opened a door, critics from a comparative-politics standpoint insisted that the unique nature of foreign policy and the wholly intergovernmental nature of foreign-policy decision-making argued that it could 'at best have a weak impact on national policies' (Hix and Goetz, 2000: 6).

From that narrow ground, however, work did progress. A critical feature that came to dominate early scholarship in the field was a focus upon the reciprocal relationship that it was argued existed between national- and European-level policymaking. Arguing against traditional realist and intergovernmental interpretations, the contention was made that the formulation and outputs of national foreign policies were changing as a direct result of participating in European foreign-policy cooperation and that at the same time, states were actively engaged and committed to the deepening and strengthening of that collective policy system (Tonra, 2001). This became reflected in a two-dimensional model of Europeanization consisting of the aforementioned parallel and interconnected processes of uploading and downloading (Major, 2005; Wong, 2005).

Uploading is understood to be the development of EU-level institutions and policy frameworks to the preferred design of individual member states. It has also been conceptualized as the projection on the European stage of member-state policy preferences, ideas and interests. According to Wong and Hill's review (2011), uploading is indicated by efforts to increase the state's global profile, to influence EU partners' foreign policy and to use the EU as a shield/umbrella for national policy and as an influence multiplier. Through a complex system of national bargaining, policy agreements ultimately emerge to be implemented through a set of evolving, shared policy institutions. Critically, two quite different logics are often adduced to be operating here, the first strategic and the second ideational. These have been identified as sources of twin-track rationalist and sociological logics, leading to domestic adaptation (Bulmer, 2007: 53).

The first logic presents such developments as allowing member states to pursue their interests to greatest effect. Member states and their policy actors calculate the advantage of securing collective support for their preferred policy against the likelihood that such common policies may not be precisely *ad idem* with an exclusively nationally framed policy. The counterweight is that such a common position will carry much greater influence and promise greater impact than anything pursued unilaterally (Pomorska, 2007). The second logic sees such developments as at least in part a function of shifting role perceptions (Aggestam, 2004b) and/or evolving political identities. Here processes of individual and institutional socialization are seen to come into play, with national interests evolving within a collective European context and where the desire for a common European position on critical foreign-policy issues is seen to become a policy priority in its own right.

For its part, downloading is a process of national adaptation to the aforementioned European policy agreements and/or institutional structures. These are seen as exerting pressure on both the form and outputs of national foreign policy in terms of norms and

policy positions but also in terms of structures and styles. Downloading is indicated – again, according to Wong and Hill (2011) – by the greater salience of European priorities on the national agenda, the priority accorded to arriving at a collective European position and the primacy accorded to such positions and the bureaucratic changes predicated on their needs and/or requirements within EU-level policymaking structures. Again, it may be argued that two distinct logics are at play here. Rational-interest calculations arise in terms of a basic cost–benefit analysis – bearing in mind at all times that member states retain veto rights across the whole realm of foreign, security and defence policy. Member states therefore can be said to be adapting themselves to policies and structures that they perceive to be in their strategic interest. Adaptational pressures might, however, also be seen as part of the process by which norms, beliefs and policy expectations are internalized by national foreign-policy actors, creating a basis for further intensified policy interaction and agreement.

As noted, this bidirectional vertical model has been supplemented by the proposal of additional dimensions. Claudia Major was among the first to call for the inclusion of cross-loading (Major, 2005; see also Howell, 2004) as a third dimension of Europeanization within the CFSP, insisting that national foreign policy change might well derive from 'the transfer of ideas, norms and ways of doing things that are exchanged from and with European neighbours, domestic entities or policy areas. Put simply: it is not only change *due* to Europe but also *within* Europe' (2005: 186). Whether analysing the CFSP in general (Major and Pomorska, 2005), the European Neighbourhood Policy (Normann, 2012) or Finnish foreign policy (Palosaari, 2011), the idea that European states were learning from and sharing with each other has been persuasive. In his review of Europeanization Wong (2005) incorporated cross-loading into his analysis but defined it in a somewhat different fashion.

Rather than focus exclusively upon the two traditional vertical-transmission mechanisms (downloading and uploading), Wong sought to incorporate the idea of cross-loading as a horizontal policy-exchange mechanism between member states, which, together with the other two dimensions, contributed to the construction of common interests and the evolution of a shared foreign-policy identity. He dubbed this third dimension 'identity reconstruction' (Wong, 2007: 326; 2005: 142), which was related to a 'multi-directional process of socialisation' (Wong and Hill, 2011: 166). This spoke to earlier constructivist-oriented work that privileged identity politics as being at the core of the European foreign-policy process and which defined Europeanization in that context as being a 'transformation in the way in which national foreign policies are constructed, in the way 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' (Tonra, 2000: 229). This 'thick' Europeanization (as opposed to the rationalist-oriented, 'thin' Europeanization) focused on the development of shared and socially appropriate actions and the construction of intersubjective meanings through which actors' preferences and identities evolved (Schmidt, 2002; Bulmer, 2007; Checkel, 2001).

SURVEYING THE FIELD

In broad terms there is a general acknowledgement that something is happening to national foreign policies that derives from EU membership. Analysts also broadly acknowledge the difficulty of disaggregating the effects of Europeanization from other independent variables (such as globalization) and argue over the significance of the changes being identified. More than a decade ago Brian White insisted that national foreign policies had 'significantly been changed, if not transformed, by participation over time in foreign policy making at the European level' (2001: 6). More recently, Baun and Marek, in looking at the Europeanization of the foreign policies of

new EU member states, agreed that 'the foreign policies of EU member states have been transformed' (2013: 1). There is also general agreement that Europeanization does not entail the homogenization of member-state foreign policies nor a convergence towards a single EU policy point. There are clearly varying paths of adaptation to Europe.

In terms of the existing literature there are a number of studies that invoke Europeanization as an explicit independent variable in the evolution of national foreign, security and/or defence policies. A number of these are single country case studies: on Denmark (Larsen, 2005), France (Irondelle, 2003; Wong, 2006; Rieker, 2006a), Finland (Palosaari, 2011), Germany (Miskimmon, 2007), Greece (Ioakimidis, 2000; Tsardanidis and Stavridis, 2005; Economides, 2005), Malta (Fiott, 2010), Poland (Pomorska, 2007), Portugal (Raimundo, 2013) and Spain (Torreblanca, 2001). There are also studies that offer some comparative perspective among several EU member states, with different logics applied for case selection, such as methodological approach (Jokela, 2010; Thomas, 2011), small member states (Tonra, 2001), large member states (Aggestam, 2004a; Gross, 2009; Müller, 2011), Nordic states (Rieker, 2006b), neutral member states (de Flers, 2011) and even non-member states (Oğuzlu, 2010). Finally, there is a growing field of larger comparative studies that seek to cover all member states (Manners and Whitman, 2000), offer a sample across the enlarged EU (Wong and Hill, 2011) or identify other large categories of states, such as new member states (Baun and Marek, 2013), or policy towards a particular region (Ruano, 2013).

If there is agreement that national foreign policies are being transformed and we can identify continuing efforts to map these transformations across EU member states what, exactly, is it that these efforts are studying? As Bulmer (2007) points out, Europeanization is itself a phenomenon that needs to be explained rather than presented as a theory in and of itself. Clarity in this context is critical. As an independent variable, Europeanization is the explanation (the cause) for national foreign-policy change. In the absence of hard law in the foreign-policy field (which, as noted above, sets it apart from almost all other policy areas where Europeanization is studied) we tend to focus on soft law as well as political commitments, institutional development, diffusion of norms and expectations and how these serve to stimulate member-state behaviour. The causal chain in this instance can run either from the state to the common policy (uploading) or from the common policy to the state (downloading). Confusingly, however, Europeanization can also be presented in the literature as the dependent variable, i.e. the effect that we are studying (and the causes for which we are seeking). In our case this is the increasing coordination of national foreign policies, possibly leading to the creation of a truly common EU foreign and security policy. A clear differentiation between these two ideas of Europeanization is required, otherwise we are in danger of creating studies that imply Europeanization is being caused by Europeanization. At the same time it can also be argued that 'It is difficult to try to conceive of the relationship [between EU and national foreign policies] in conventional, positivist social science terms i.e. with independent and dependent variables and simple causality if analysis is to capture incrementalism and continuity' (Bulmer and Burch, 2001: 78).

The research identified above suggests that the structured and intense cooperation that underpins the CFSP (including the CSDP) serves to develop and instantiate specified norms of agreed behaviour. These norms are not those of a hierarchical policy centre to which national foreign policies are adapting, but are the shared patrimony of member states endeavouring to strengthen their foreign policies respectively and collectively. Beginning as an informal and virtually unstructured system of information sharing, it has evolved into an 'institutionalised, collective, binding and community-sensitive system' (Ginsberg, 2001: 37–8). Arising from this, a variety of agreed procedures and processes has been hardwired into national foreign-policy construction.

This has, in turn, given rise to what has been identified as ‘a corporate body of European values and norms and eventually caused Member States to change their attitudes and preferences despite the absence of enforcement mechanisms’ (Ginsberg 2001: 38). This results in a Europeanized foreign policy, defined as one that ‘takes common EU positions as a major reference point, does not generally defect from common positions, attempts to pursue its priorities through EU collective action, and subscribes positively to the values and principles expressed by the EU’ (Wong and Hill, 2011: 211).

The key criticism of many of these studies is that they identify the shape of Europeanization including *inter alia* elite socialization, bureaucratic reorganization, constitutional change and public support for foreign-policy cooperation (Smith, 2000: 617), but they contribute little to theory building (de Flers and Müller 2012: 24). A more recent academic turn therefore tries to lift the lid on Europeanization and to begin to specify precisely how the phenomenon works. Rieker (2006a), for example, frames Europeanization as a process both of strategic adjustment (adaptation) and identity change (learning). Gross (2009) speaks of an overall European reflex where, through process tracing, one can assess whether Europeanization has resulted in policy change as a result of strategic adaptation or socialization. The criticism is that studies of Europeanization to date have presented empirical evidence that has ‘been either ambiguous or even irrelevant in the sense that it indicates little regarding the considerations of national foreign policy-makers that preceded foreign policy change’ (Moumoutzis 2011: 622).

A first set of approaches to unpacking Europeanization are grounded within a rationalist logic (Thomas, 2009; Thomas and Tonra, 2011). Here costs and benefits are adduced to determine the degree to which (if at all) national foreign policy should adapt itself to, or should seek to exploit, common EU foreign-policy structures and agreements. This is especially evident in policy export, uploading or projection, where most if not all studies conclude that member states actively seek to engage common institutions better to fulfil national foreign-policy aims. This, of course, is not definitive evidence of Europeanization since coordination per se occurs within all multilateral institutions to which EU member states are party, and those foreign-policy goals are undergoing no necessary transformation as a result of efforts to secure their multilateral agreement. However, knowing where and when member states calculate that the incorporation of shared EU-level processes and structures into national foreign-policy construction will deliver added value, one can begin to identify how such incorporation may result in a thin Europeanization rooted in a variety of strategies from competitive bargaining and logrolling to cooperative bargaining and even normative entrapment. In such models ‘national foreign policy-makers engage in strategic calculation in an attempt to maximize the attainment of fixed policy preferences and secure specific foreign policy goals’ (Moumoutzis, 2011: 617). Such instrumental logics have been seen to be at play in almost all studies of Europeanization of foreign policy, either on their own terms or as an early stage in a more profound process of deeper and thicker Europeanization.

The second set of approaches to Europeanization may be said to be rooted much more profoundly in a logic of appropriateness (March and Olsen, 1984), where policy actors in EU member states are guided, if not shaped, by shared understandings of what is standard, right or normal within given circumstances. As shared policy construction deepens and strengthens over time, these understandings are extended and become *de rigueur* for both current and prospective policy participants. A number of recent studies have thus begun to focus more precisely on the means and mechanisms by which this occurs and, by and large, they have settled on mechanisms of socialization and learning. The goal here is to identify EU-level practices, procedures and norms that can reasonably be

said to have caused identifiable changes in national foreign policy (Moumoutzis, 2011).

In their comprehensive review de Flers and Müller (2012) consider socialization and learning through these two lenses. Socialization, for example, may be strategic where norm-based arguing ensues or where state actors adapt their behaviours to mesh with well established social expectations (Checkel, 2005). Alternatively, role socialization may be visible where preference and identity change results (Aggestam, 1999; Tonra, 2001). They also highlight the necessary scope conditions for such socialization, drawing upon insights from social psychology and associated work looking specifically at the EU context of such socialization (Beyers, 2005; Checkel, 2005; Lewis, 2005; Quaglia et al., 2008). These can include conditions such as the intensity, duration and frequency of formal and informal interaction, the degree of actor autonomy within such interactions and the context of those interactions, whether these are iterative/deliberative or crisis/bargaining situations.

Others too have sought to put a shape upon the conditions under which Europeanization may or may not occur (Bulmer and Burch, 2000; Knill, 2001; Gross, 2009) and these have included history, orientation, size, geopolitical identity, national norms and strategic culture as mediating phenomena. History, for example, may create very specific *domaines réservé* towards old allies or even older adversaries; geo-strategic size may sharply colour perceptions of institutional and bureaucratic change; geo-political identity might well create distinctive cross-cutting pressures in dealing with third countries; national norms, especially regarding thematic foreign policy issues, can be expected either to facilitate or frustrate collective policy endeavours and strategic culture will doubtless shape national approaches to security and defence. These issues have all been highlighted and their significance acknowledged, but as yet they have not been operationalized systematically to give us a clear capacity to measure their distinctive and interrelated impacts.

When considering the role of learning as part of a process of Europeanization, de Flers and Müller (2012) also distinguish between thin learning, where actors readjust beliefs and preferences to achieve well established national goals, and thick learning, where basic national assumptions are challenged and associated policy preferences evolve. This then results in the reshaping of values and identities. They go on to assess learning in an EU context as being of varying types: organizational (Juncos and Pomorska, 2006), lesson-drawing and policy transfer (Kerber and Eckardt, 2007) and, finally, policy-learning (Davis Cross, 2006; Krahmann, 2003; Mérand, 2008). The scope conditions identified for such learning are similar to those of socialization but extend to instances of repeated or extensive policy failure that act as external stimuli for policy reconsideration and recalibration.

In their review Wong and Hill (2011) identify the variables that they argue underpin Europeanization. These include institutions and treaties, socialization, leadership, external federators, the politics of scale, legitimization of global roles and geo-cultural identity. They also highlight what they characterize as countervailing factors to Europeanization, such as ideological hostility, domestic politics, international forces and special relationships. In sum, they offer a menu for the identification and potential measurement of forces that can define the degree and extent of Europeanization in any set of national cases.

A number of scholars have addressed another criticism in the study of the Europeanization of national foreign policy – namely, the failure to identify the precise ways in which national foreign policies change as a direct result of European engagement and the assumption that Europeanization is a unilinear process. Moumoutzis (2011) identifies three areas within which evidence of Europeanization might be identified: where national foreign-policy goals shift to European norms, where national foreign-policy practices and the use of foreign-policy instruments change to match European models and, finally, where EU procedures serve to affect national

foreign-policymaking and policy actors. Wong and Hill (2011: 232) – in perhaps the broadest comparative study yet undertaken – have determined that Europeanization is indeed a relevant concept, an independent variable that has a demonstrable impact on behaviour but whose impact varies across member states and is strongest in areas of procedure and general orientation rather than in specific policy commitments.

CONCLUSION AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

The contribution of Europeanization to our scholarship has been threefold. First, it has contributed to wider IR by reinforcing a focus upon learning and socialization. This has become a core feature of much constructivist and liberal-oriented scholarship in the area. Second, Europeanization has offered specific added value to foreign-policy analysis (White, 1999), challenging US-centric accounts of foreign-policy construction and offering a *via media* between mutually exclusive accounts of intergovernmental versus supranational understandings of the development of an EU foreign policy, where the former could accommodate only lowest-common-denominator outcomes and the latter could assume only an inevitable trajectory to a fully federal foreign policy. Third, Europeanization has provided a critical reflection on the evolution of domestic polities within a European framework and the processes by which these systems are impacted by, and contribute to, shared policymaking structures and outcomes.

At the same time we are still left with significant challenges in making use of the concept. Two paths appear to be open. The first is to insist upon a precise differentiation of our dependent and independent variables. Thus, for example, where Europeanization is seen as being the dependent variable, i.e. the thing to be studied, we might be well advised to use a separate and distinctive term such as ‘European integration’. If such a term can be stripped of the baggage of its implied supranationalism then this can entail the study of EU foreign policy and its institutional structures and governance, the impact of intergovernmental policy coordination on national foreign policies and, finally, the process of horizontal foreign-policy development between EU member states. The aim of such studies would then be the search for causal explanations of these phenomena.

As an independent variable, i.e. the cause of the aforementioned European integration a variety of options have been tabled, from the pressure to adapt and the fit between EU and national policy (at institutional or policy level) to the various interests and coalitions within policymaking that lead to particular shared policy outcomes. These might also benefit from dropping the Europeanization tag entirely and perhaps redeploying earlier terms such as the ‘EU-ization’ (Miskimmon and Paterson, 2003; Tsardanidis and Stavridis, 2005), the ‘Brusselsization’ (Allen, 1998; Müller-Brandeck-Bocquet, 2002) or the ‘Europeification’ (Andersen and Eliasen, 1995) of national foreign policies. Taken together, these two prescriptions imply giving up entirely on Europeanization as a useful concept for the study of EU foreign policy (Knill, 2008).

A second path takes as a starting point the assumption that a precise differentiation as outlined above may not, in fact, be appropriate. Instead, it assumes that EU and national foreign policies are, in fact, mutually constituted or exist in a reciprocal relationship that does not easily lend itself to neat packaging in terms of dependent and independent variables. Here the focus is upon learning and socialization, discursive interactions and/or processes of identity creation. Thus ‘the EU may provide the context, the cognitive and normative “frame”, the terms of reference, or the opportunities for socialisation of domestic actors who then produce “exchanges” (of ideas, power, policies, and so on) between each other’ (Radaelli, 2004: 7).

These paths focus on change – but there is a further challenge: how does one estimate

the role of Europeanization in such change? In the first instance there is a danger of selection bias in that the cases selected are frequently either EU members or EU members in waiting. There is certainly a paucity of studies that apply control cases. Second, there is the challenge of disaggregation. How does one ensure that the phenomenon being witnessed is Europeanization as opposed, for example, to other variables such as globalization, modernization or democratization? Here, again, control cases would help (Verdier and Breen, 2001).

There are, nonetheless, many avenues for further research using the analytical and conceptual tools now encompassed by a maturing literature. De Flers and Müller (2012), for example, suggest the need for further theory-guided research to excavate member states' pursuit of their interests within European foreign-policymaking. They suggest that different policy-uploading strategies may be deployed under varying conditions and that it might be possible to map these strategies against different modes of negotiation (Thomas, 2009). Attention, too, might be given to looking more deeply at policy-learning, most especially dissecting specific instances of crisis and policy failure and mapping the ensuing shifts of structures, process and procedures. Further work might also be undertaken to test assumptions surrounding socialization and learning, which are frequently asserted and sometimes deduced in a non-systematic or atheoretical fashion.

There is also much policy-oriented work to be undertaken to identify patterns of national divergence on major issue areas, tracing these back to unique or shared ideational or other issues (such as those noted above) and identifying processes by which such divergences narrow (if at all) over time. Similarly, there might be some very useful work done on policy defections, in identifying the scope conditions and thresholds at which member states are willing to break from an established or emergent policy consensus and the significance/impact of such a policy break. Finally, still more comparative work might be undertaken with respect to Europeanization and non-member states: the extent to which (if at all) non-EU states such as Turkey, Norway and Switzerland have converged towards common EU foreign-policy positions and processes and to identify whether this is a function of EU soft power, and the strategic pursuit of EU membership and/or the export of EU norms and governance (Christiansen et al., 2000). Such an agenda opens a vista to a more rigorous application of a concept that so many analysts have relied upon.

NOTE

1 According to Bulmer and Radaelli (2004: 4), these modes of governance comprised: 1) Governance by Negotiation, i.e. traditional EU policymaking, Governance by Hierarchy, split into two modes of 2) positive and 3) negative integration (where substantial policymaking authority had been devolved to EU supranational institutions) and 4) Governance by Facilitated Coordination (where there is limited or no engagement of EU supranational institutions and decision-making is essentially in the hands of member states).

REFERENCES

Aggestam, L. (1999) *Role Conceptions and the Politics of Identity in Foreign Policy*. ARENA Working Paper WP 99/8, ARENA: Centre for European Studies, Oslo.

Aggestam, L. (2004a) *A European Foreign Policy? Role Conceptions and the Politics of Identity in Britain, France and Germany*. Stockholm: Statsvetenskapliga institutionen.

Aggestam, L. (2004b) 'Role-identity and the Europeanization of Foreign Policy: A Political-cultural Approach' in B. Tonra and T. Christiansen (eds.), *Rethinking European Union Foreign Policy*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, pp. 81–98.

Allen, D. (1996) 'Conclusions: The European Rescue of National Foreign Policy?' in C, Hill (ed.), *The Actors in Europe's Foreign Policy*. New York: Routledge, pp. 288–304.

Allen, D. (1998) 'Who Speaks for Europe? The Search for an Effective and Coherent External Policy' in J. Peterson and H. Sjursen (eds.),

A Common Foreign Policy for Europe? London: Routledge, pp. 41–58.

Andersen, S. and Eliassen, K. (eds.) (1995) *Policy Making in Europe. The Europeification of National Policy Making*. London: Sage.

Aspinwall, M. D. and Schneider, G. (2000) 'Same Menu, Separate tables: The Institutionalist Turn in Political Science and the Study of European Integration', *European Journal of Political Research*, 38(1): 1–36.

Baun, M. and Marek, D. (eds.) (2013) *The New Member States and the European Union: Foreign policy and Europeanization*. London: Routledge.

Beyers, J. (2005) 'Multiple Embeddedness and Socialisation in Europe: The Case of the Council Officials', *International Organization* 59(4): 899–936.

Börzel, T. (2003). *Shaping and Taking EU Policies: Member State Responses to Europeanization* (No. p0035). Queens University Belfast: https://ideas.repec.org/p/erp/queens/p0035.html (last accessed 29 January 2015).

Börzel, T.A. and Risse, T. (2000) 'When Europe Hits Home: Europeanisation and Domestic Change', *European Integration online Papers (EIoP)* 4(15): http://eiop.or.at/eiop/texte/2000-015a.htm (last accessed 29 January 2015).

Bulmer, Simon, (2007) 'Theorizing Europeanization' in P. Graziano and M. Vink (eds.), *Europeanization: New Research Agendas*. Basingstoke: Palgrave, pp. 46–58.

Bulmer, S. and Burch, M. (2000) 'Coming to Terms with Europe: Europeanisation, Whitehall and the Challenge of Devolution', *Queen's Papers on Europeanisation*, http://econpapers.repec.org/paper/erpqueens/p0009.htm (last accessed 29 January 2015).

Bulmer, S. and Burch, M. (2001) 'The "Europeanisation" of Central Government: The UK and Germany in Historical Institutionalist Perspective' in G. Schneider and M. Aspinwall (eds.), *The Rules of Integration*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, pp. 73–96.

Bulmer, S. and Lequesne, C. (2002) 'New Perspectives on EU–Member State Relationships', *Question de recherche*, 4, Janvier: http://www.ceri-sciences-po.org/publica/question/qdr4.pdf (last accessed 29 January 2015).

Bulmer, S. and Radaelli, C. (2004) 'The Europeanisation of National Policy?', *Queen's Papers on Europeanisation*, 1/2004: https://ideas.repec.org/p/erp/queens/p0042.html (last accessed 29 January 2015).

Checkel, J.T. (2001) 'The Europeanisation of Citizenship?' in J. Caporaso, M.G. Cowles and T. Risse (eds.), *Transforming Europe: Europeanisation and Domestic Change*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, pp. 180–97.

Checkel, J.T. (2005) 'International Institutions and Socialisation in Europe: Introduction and Framework', *International Organization* 59(4): 801–26.

Christiansen, T., Petito, F. and Tonra, B. (2000) 'Fuzzy Politics Around Fuzzy Borders: The European Union's "Near Abroad"', *Cooperation and Conflict*, 35(4): 389–415.

Davis Cross, M.K. (2006) *The European Diplomatic Corps: Diplomats and International Cooperation from Westphalia to Maastricht.* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

de Flers, N.A. (2011) *EU Foreign Policy and the Europeanization of Neutral States: Comparing Irish and Austrian Foreign Policy*. London: Routledge.

de Flers, N.A. and Müller, P. (2012) 'Dimensions and Mechanisms of the Europeanization of Member State Foreign Policy: State of the Art and New Research Avenues', *Journal of European Integration*, 34(1): 19–35.

de Schoutheete, P. (1986) *La coopération politique européenne*. Paris/Brussels: Nathan/Labor.

Economides, S. (2005) 'The Europeanisation of Greek Foreign Policy', *West European Politics* 28(2): 471–91.

Fiott, D. (2010) 'How Europeanized Has Maltese Foreign Policy Become?', *Mediterranean Quarterly*, 21(3): 104–18.

Geddes, A. (2003) 'Still Beyond Fortress Europe? Patterns and Pathways in EU Migration Policy', *Queen's Papers on Europeanisation*, 4/2003: http://econpapers.repec.org/paper/erpqueens/p0037.htm (last accessed 29 January 2015).

Ginsberg, R.H. (2001) *The European Union in International Politics. Baptism by Fire*. Maryland: Rowman and Littlefield.

Graziano, P. and Vink, M.P. (eds.) (2007) *Europeanization: New Research Agendas*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Gross, E. (2009) *The Europeanization of National Foreign Policy. Continuity and*

Change in European Crisis Management. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
Harmsen, R. and Wilson, T.M. (2000) 'Introduction: Approaches to Europeanisation', *Yearbook of European Studies* 14: 13–26.
Héritier, A. (2005) 'Europeanization Research East and West: A Comparative Assessment' in F. Schimmelfennig and U. Sedelmeier (eds.) *The Europeanization of Central and Eastern Europe*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, pp. 199–209.
Hill, C. (ed.) (1983) *National Foreign Policies and European Political Cooperation*. London: Allen and Unwin.
Hix, S. and Goetz, K.H. (2000) 'Introduction: European Integration and National Political Systems', *West European Politics* 23(4): 1–26.
Howell, K.E. (2004) 'Developing Conceptualisations of Europeanisation: A Study of Financial Services', *Politics* 24(1): 20–5.
Ioakimidis, P.C. (2000) 'The Europeanisation of Greece's Foreign Policy: Progress and Problems', in A. Mitsos and E. Mossialos (eds.) *Contemporary Greece and Europe*. Aldershot: Ashgate, pp. 359–72.
Irondelle, B. (2003) 'Europeanisation without the European Union? French Military Reforms 1991–96', *Journal of European Public Policy* 10(2): 208–26.
Jokela, J. (2010) *Europeanisation and Foreign Policy*. London: Routledge.
Jørgensen, K.E. (1997) 'PoCo: The Diplomatic Republic of Europe', in K.E. Jørgensen (ed.) *Reflective Approaches to European Governance*. London: Macmillan, pp. 167–80.
Juncos, A.E., and Pomorska, K. (2006) 'Playing the Brussels Game: Strategic Socialisation in the CFSP Council Working Groups', *European Integration online Papers (EIoP)* 10(11): http://econpapers.repec.org/article/erpeiopxx/p0154.htm (last accessed 29 January 2015).
Kerber, W. and Eckardt, M. (2007) 'Policy Learning in Europe: The Open Method of Co-ordination and Laboratory Federalism', *Journal of European Public Policy* 14(2): 227–47.
Knill, C. (2001) *The Europeanisation of National Administrations. Patterns of Institutional Change and Persistence*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Knill, C. (2008) 'The EU's Impact on Domestic Policies: Perspectives for Future Research' in B. Kohler Koch and F. Larat (eds.) *Efficient and Democratic Governance in the European Union*, CONNEX Report Series, No. 9: www.researchgate.net/publication/…/9c960526d7d135b061.pdf (last accessed 29 January 2015).
Kohler-Koch, B. (1996) 'Catching up with Change: The Transformation of Governance in the European Union', *Journal of European Public Policy*, 3(3): 359–80.
Krahmann, E. (2003) *Multilevel Networks in European Foreign Policy.* Aldershot: Ashgate.
Kux, S. and Sverdrup, U. (2000) 'Fuzzy Borders and Adaptive Outsiders: Norway, Switzerland and the EU', *Journal of European Integration*, 22(3): 237–70.
Ladrech, R. (1994) 'Europeanisation of Domestic Politics and Institutions: The Case of France', *Journal of Common Market Studies* 32(1): 69–88.
Larsen, H. (2005) *Analyzing the Foreign Policy of Small States in the EU: The Case of Denmark*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.
Lægreid, P., Steinthorsson, R.S. and Thorhallsson, B. (2004) 'Europeanization of Central Government Administration in the Nordic States', *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, 42(2): 347–69.
Lawton, T.C. (1999) 'Governing the Skies: Conditions for the Europeanisation of Airlines Policy', *Journal of Public Policy* 19(1): 91–112.
Levi-Faur, D. (2002) 'On the "Net Impact" of Europeanisation. The EU's Telecoms and Electricity Regimes between the Global and the National', *European Integration online Papers (EIoP)* 6(7): http://eiop.or.at/eiop/texte/2002-007a.htm (last accessed 29 January 2015).
Lewis, J. (2005) 'The Janus Face of Brussels: Socialization and Everyday Decision-making in the European Union', *International Organization* 59(4): 937–71.
Lodge, M. (2006) 'The Europeanization of Governance – Top Down, Bottom Up or Both?' in G.F. Schuppert (ed.), *The Europeanisation of Governance*. Baden-Baden: Nomos, pp. 60–76.
Mair, P. (2004) Review section, *Journal of European Public Policy* 11: 337–48.
Major, C. (2005) 'Europeanization and Foreign and Security Policy: Undermining or Rescuing the Nation State?', *Politics* 25(3): 175–90.

Major, C., and Pomorska, K. (2005) 'Europeanisation: Framework or Fashion?' *CFSP Forum* 3(5): 1–4.

Manners, I. and Whitman, R. (eds.) (2000) *The Foreign Policies of European Union Member States*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

March, J.G. and Olsen, J.P. (1984) 'The New Institutionalism: Organizational Factors in Political Life', *The American Political Science Review*, 78(3): 734–49.

Marciacq, F. (2012) 'The Political Geographies of Europeanisation: Mapping the Contested Conceptions of Europeanisation', *Journal of Contemporary European Research*, 8(1): 57–74.

Marks, G. (1993) 'Structural Policy and Multilevel Governance in the EC', in A. Cafruny and G. Rosenthal (eds.) *The State of the European Community*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, pp. 391–409

Mérand, F. (2008) *European Defence Policy: Beyond the Nation State.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Milward, A. (1992) *The European Rescue of the Nation State*. London: Routledge.

Miskimmon, A. (2007) *Germany and EU Foreign Policy: Between Europeanization and National Adaptation.* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Miskimmon, A. and Paterson, W.E. (2003) 'Foreign and Security Policy: On the Cusp between Transformation and Accommodation' in K. Dyson and K.H. Goetz (eds.), *Germany, Europe and the Politics of Constraints*,. Oxford: Oxford University Press for the British Academy, pp. 325–45.

Moravcsik, A. (1993) 'Preferences and Power in the European Community: A Liberal Intergovernmentalist Approach', *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, 31(4): 473–524.

Moumoutzis, K. (2011) 'Still Fashionable yet Useless? Addressing Problems with Research on the Europeanization of Foreign Policy', *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, 49(3): 607–29.

Müller, P. (2011) 'The Europeanization of Germany's Foreign Policy toward the Israeli–Palestinian Conflict: Between Adaptation to the EU and National Projection', *Mediterranean Politics*, 16(3): 385–403.

Müller-Brandeck-Bocquet, Gisela (2002) 'The New CFSP and ESDP Decision-making of the European Union', *European Foreign Affairs Review* 7: 257–82.

Normann, C. (2012) 'Analysing the Evolution of the European Neighbourhood Policy: Theoretical and Methodological Triangulation', in E. Ratga and O.A. Spaiser (eds.) *Understanding European Neighbourhood Policies: Concepts, Actors, Perceptions*. Berlin: NOMOS, pp. 53–69.

Nuttall, S.J. (1992) *European Political Cooperation*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Oğuzlu, T. (2010) 'Turkey and Europeanization of Foreign Policy?', *Political Science Quarterly*, 125(4): 657–83.

Olsen, J.P. (2002) 'The Many Faces of Europeanisation', *Journal of Common Market Studies* 40(5): 921–52.

Olsen, J. (2003) 'Towards a European Administrative Space?', *Journal of European Public Policy*, 10(4): 506–31.

Palosaari, T. (2011) *The Art of Adaptation: A Study on the Europeanization of Finnish Foreign and Security Policy*. Tampere: Tampere Peace Research Institute.

Pomorska, K. (2007) 'The Impact of Enlargement: Europeanization of Polish Foreign Policy? Tracking Adaptation and Change in the Polish Ministry of Foreign Affairs', *The Hague Journal of Diplomacy*, 2(1): 25–51.

Quaglia, L., De Francesco, F. and Radaelli, C.M. (2008) 'Committee Governance and Socialization in the European Union', *Journal of European Public Policy* 15(1): 155–66.

Radaelli, C. (2000) 'Whither Europeanisation? Concept Stretching and Substantive Change', *European Integration online Papers (EIoP)* 4(8): http://eiop.or.at/eiop/texte/2000-008a.htm (last accessed 29 January 2015).

Radaelli, C. (2004) 'Europeanisation: Solution or Problem?', *European Integration online Papers (EIoP)* 8(16): http://eiop.or.at/eiop/texte/2004-016a.htm (last accessed 29 January 2015).

Raimundo, A. (2013) 'The Europeanisation of Foreign Policy: An Assessment of the EU Impact on Portugal's Post-colonial Relations in Sub-Saharan Africa', *European Integration Online Papers* 17: http://eiop.or.at/eiop/index.php/eiop/article/view/2013_001a (last accessed 29 January 2015).

Rieker, P. (2006a) From common defence to comprehensive security: Towards the

Europeanization of French foreign and security policy?. *Security Dialogue*, 37(4): 509–528.

Rieker, P. (2006b) Norway and the ESDP: explaining Norwegian participation in the EU's Security policy. *European Security*, 15(3): 281–298.

Risse, T., Green Cowles, M. and Caporaso, J. (2001) 'Europeanization and Domestic Change: Introduction', in M. Green Cowles, J. Caporaso and T. Risse (eds.) *Transforming Europe: Europeanization and Domestic Change*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, pp.1–20.

Ruano, L. (ed.) (2013) *The Europeanization of National Foreign Policies Towards Latin America*. London: Routledge.

Schimmelfennig, F. and Sedelmeier, U. (eds.) (2005) *The Europeanisation of Central and Eastern Europe*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Schmidt, V.A. (2002) 'Does discourse matter in the politics of welfare adjustment?', *Comparative Political Studies*, 35(2) March: 168–193.

Smith, M.E. (2000) 'Conforming to Europe: The Domestic Impact of Foreign Policy Co-operation', *Journal of European Public Policy* 7(4): 613–31.

Thomas, D.C. (2009) 'Explaining the Negotiation of EU Foreign Policy: Normative Institutionalism and Alternative Approaches', *International Politics*, 46(4): 339–57.

Thomas, D.C. (2011) *Making EU Foreign Policy: National Preferences, European Norms and Common Policies*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Thomas, D. C. and Tonra, B. (2011) 'To What Ends EU Foreign Policy? Contending Approaches to the Union's Diplomatic Objectives and Representation', *The Hague Journal of Diplomacy*, 7(1): 11.

Tonra, B. (2000) 'Denmark and Ireland' in I. Manners and R. Whitman (eds.), *The Foreign Policies of the European Union Member States*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, pp. 224–42.

Tonra, B. (2001) *The Europeanisation of National Foreign Policy: Dutch, Danish and Irish Foreign Policy in the European Union*. Aldershot: Ashgate.

Torreblanca, J.I. (2001) 'Ideas, Preferences and Institutions: Explaining the Europeanization of Spanish Foreign Policy', *Arena Working Papers* 26: http://www.sv.uio.no/arena/english/research/publications/arena-publications/workingpapers/working-papers2001/01_26.xml (last accessed 29 January 2015).

Tsardanidis, C. and Stavridis, C. (2005) 'The Europeanisation of Greek Foreign Policy: A Critical Appraisal', *European Integration* 27(2): 217–39.

Verdier, D. and Breen, R. (2001) 'Europeanization and Globalization: Politics against Markets', *Comparative Political Studies* 34(3): 227–62.

White, B. (1999) 'The European Challenge to Foreign Policy Analysis', *European Journal of International Relations* 5(1): 37–66.

White, B. (2001) *Understanding European Foreign Policy*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Wong, R.Y. (2005) 'The Europeanization of Foreign Policy', in C. Hill and M. Smith (eds.) *International Relations and the EU*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp.134–53.

Wong, R.Y. (2006) *The Europeanization of French Foreign Policy. France and the EU in East Asia.* Basingstoke, New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Wong, R.Y. (2007) 'Foreign Policy', in P. Graziano and M.P. Vink (eds.) *Europeanization: New Research Agendas*. Basingstoke, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 321–34.

Wong, R. and Hill, C. (eds.) (2011) *National and European Foreign Policy*. London: Routledge.