

What is Europeanization?

and Other Questions on a New Research Agenda

Paper for the Second YEN Research Meeting on Europeanisation,
University of Bocconi, Milan, 22-23 November 2002

Maarten Vink
(Leiden University)*

1. What (Very Briefly) Is Europeanization?

The concept of Europeanization enjoys increasing popularity within the study of European integration. Although there is considerable conceptual contestation with regard to the question what it actually is, the bulk of the literature speaks of Europeanization when something in the domestic political system is affected by something European. Hence we can define Europeanization for the moment and very briefly as domestic change caused by European integration.

This provisional definition obviously leaves us with many questions yet to answer more precisely, such as what kind of change is Europeanization (and what not), what is 'European' about Europeanization, where does it come from, and what does it do to us? Other, more general, questions that arise are why did a whole new research agenda evolve, and what does Europeanization tell us about (theories of) European integration? This paper aims to outline the main questions related to the new research agenda of Europeanization, to formulate some preliminary answers to these sometimes thorny questions, and finally to

* Department of Political Science, Leiden University. PO Box 9555, 2300 RB Leiden, The Netherlands.
Email: mpvink@fsw.leidenuniv.nl.

conclude where we should go from here.

2. Why A New Research Agenda?

Scholars of European integration increasingly employ the concept of Europeanization to assess the European sources of domestic politics. This shift from a direct study of European institutions to a more indirect approach via the national political domain has been foreboded from the mid-1990's onwards by collections on the institutional adaptation of member states to EU membership (Mény *et al*, 1996; Rometsch and Wessels, 1996; Hanf and Soetendorp, 1998; Kassim *et al*, 2000; Zeff and Pirro, 2001). A new research agenda has now evolved focusing more generally on changes in national political systems that can be attributed to European integration (see Green Cowles *et al* 2001 for a recent collection of empirical studies; for more reflective contributions, see Hix and Goetz 2000; Radaelli 2000; Börzel and Risse 2000; Risse *et al* 2001; Knill and Lehmkuhl 2002).

In contrast predominantly with the liberal intergovernmentalist stress on the domestic sources of European politics (Moravcsik, 1993, 1998), and somewhat reminiscent of earlier debates in international relations, the new research agenda of Europeanization has provided the study of European integration with a 'Second Image Reversed' (Gourevitch, 1978). It is however not only the intergovernmental paradigm and its overwhelming attention for 'grand bargains' that is being contested (or amended) by the agenda of Europeanization, but all traditional approaches to European integration more generally. After all, classic neo-functionalism (Haas, 1958; Lindberg, 1963), its contemporary counterpart of supranational governance (Stone Sweet and Sandholz, 1998) and to a lesser extent also the multi-level governance approach (Hooghe and Marks, 2001; Kohler-Koch and Eising, 1999) equally concentrate at European institutions and their output in terms of European policies.

The research agenda of Europeanization has undoubtedly enriched the study of European integration by pointing out some previously under-researched questions, particularly related to the domestic implementation of

European policies. Scholars go at great lengths to explain the differences in transposition rates of European directives in EU member states (e.g. Börzel, 2002). Implementation processes are studied in great detail –characteristically in such fields as environmental policy (Knill, 1998; Haverland, 2000) or transport policy (Héritier *et al*, 2001). However, the research agenda of Europeanization now focuses on wider changes in the 'organizational logic of national politics and policy-making' (Ladrech, 1994: 70; cf. Börzel, 1999; Harmsen, 1999; Schmidt, 1999; Falkner, 2001). Moreover, scholars increasingly study aspects of national politics that have traditionally been assumed less subject to European influence, such as political parties (Ladrech, 2002), party systems (Mair, 2000), local government (De Rooij, 2002), refugee policies (Lavenex, 2001) or citizenship (Checkel, 2001; Vink, 2001). Finally, processes of Europeanization are not restricted to EU member states only, but also take place in non-members Switzerland and Norway (Mach *et al*, 2002) and in candidate countries in Central and Eastern Europe (Goetz, 2001; Grabbe, 2001).

3. So What Kind Of Change Is Europeanization...?

As stated above Europeanization can most generally be defined as domestic change caused by European integration. This still leaves us with the question, however, what kind of change Europeanization actually is. Hix and Goetz (2000: 27) are more precise in their definition as 'a process of change in national institutional and policy practices that can be attributed to European integration.' This definition connects quite well to the one by Börzel (1999: 574), as 'a process by which domestic policy areas become increasingly subject to European policymaking', except from the fact that she limits Europeanization to change in policy practices (although her study actually focuses on territorial *politics*).

As opposed to such a rather narrow definition, Ladrech (1994) points at change more generally, including also citizenship and national identity (see also Checkel, 2001; Risse, 2001). Drawing upon this definition, Radaelli's (2000: 4)

conception of Europeanization refers to '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 making of EU decisions and then incorporated in the logic of domestic discourses, identities, political structures and public policies.' Although arguably this definition is too encompassing to survive as a clear definition of what Europeanization is, it does underline the importance of change not only in the output of political systems (public policies) but also in the underlying structures and identities.

4. ...and What Not?

To avoid the danger of conceptual stretching, as Radaelli (2000) rightly notes, we need to specify not only what Europeanization is but also what it is *not*. Europeanization should not be confused with convergence, neither with harmonization, nor with political integration. This can briefly be clarified as follows. *Convergence* can be a consequence of European integration, but it must not be used synonymously with Europeanization because there is a difference between a process and its consequences (Radaelli, 2000: 5). There has been convergence in monetary policies towards monetarist policy and away from Keynesianism in the member states that joined the EMU (Sbragia, 2001). Yet, European regimes may be converging, as in the case of citizenship policies, however not as a result of initiatives emanating from Brussels, but as a response to domestic considerations (Freeman and Ögelman, 1998). *Harmonization* of national policies is often seen as an important goal of European integration, but empirical research suggests that Europeanization is often manifest in a 'differential' impact of European requirements on domestic policies (Héritier et al, 2001). European directives aimed at harmonization in, let's say, gender equality policy, in effect often leave much room for continued national diversity (Caporaso and Jupille, 2001).

Understanding, finally, why countries pool and delegate sovereignty (Milward, 1994; Moravcsik, 1998) is not equal to understanding the specific dynamics, or even the unexpected consequences, this process of *political integration* brings about at the domestic level. Europeanization is crucially related to the feedback process of European integration. In this regard Risse *et al* (2001: 1) clearly are the exception by defining Europeanization as 'the emergence and development *at the European level* of distinct structures of governance' (emphasis added). This definition diverges from most of the literature on Europeanization because it does not relate necessarily to the domestic level. From the point of view of conceptual clarity it seems rather questionable to add a new concept as a synonym for concepts such as European integration or Communitarization (Radaelli, 2000: 2; Bulmer and Lequesne, 2001: 10).

5. What Is 'European' About Europeanization?

A last conceptual clarification regards the 'European' aspect of Europeanization. The concept of Europeanization is seemingly monopolized by scholars of the unification process between the member states of the European Union, and concentrates on requirements coming from Brussels. Yet, it must be recognized that 'European integration' in itself covers a wider range of processes and institutions. Europeanization is more than just EU-ization. One can think of such institutions as the European Free Trade Area (EFTA) in the economic sphere, the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE) in the field of international relations, and the Council of Europe (COE) in the area of human rights. The fact that these institutions are often highly intertwined with the European Union in terms of organization¹ and even identity² does not preclude

¹ Think of the European Economic Area Agreement (EEA) between the EU and the EFTA.

² The EU and the COE share the same 'European' blue flag with twelve golden stars as well as the 'Ode to Joy' from Beethoven's Ninth Symphony as anthem.

their distinct origins and institutions. Second, and perhaps more important, not restricting the concept of Europeanization solely to the impact of the EU has the advantage of being able to apply the same methodological tools for larger processes within Europe, and for other cases of regional integration. In such a way we can embrace the theoretical argument to view the European Union not as a unique phenomenon that requires a *sui generis* explanation, but as an advanced instance of regional cooperation (Moravcsik, 1998: 4-5; cf. Caporaso, 1999: 161; Olsen, 2001).

6. Where Does It Come From?

'To be able to understand the impact of European integration on domestic systems it does not matter whether delegation is determined by domestic government preferences, driven by transnational economic actors, or 'cultivated' by supranational entrepreneurs. What matters for domestic actors and institutions is how the delegation to the European level changes policy outcomes in the domestic arena.' Hix and Goetz (2000: 3-4) underline the difference of the new research agenda of Europeanization with traditional approaches to European integration. At face value such a top-down approach would imply that we need to look at, let's say, domestic policy A at time t_0 and t_1 (before and after European integration in a given policy area), see how much it has changed, and analyze whether and how 'Europe' can be used to explain this change. Approaching Europeanization, however, exclusively from a 'top-down rather than bottom-up perspective' may in the end fail to recognize the more complex two-way causality of European integration (Börzel, 1999: 574; but see Börzel and Risse, 2000: 1; Börzel, 2002: 195). After all, even when EU policies can admittedly strongly affect domestic policies, these policies do not come out of the blue, but are the result –among others– of political action by domestic actors who shift domestic issues to the European level (cf. Putnam, 1988). In order to analyze the range of policies that may or may not get Europeanized, we need to understand

when and how Europe becomes involved in issues that are traditionally regulated at the national level. Hence a closer look is required at the dynamics of the European integration process.³

One of the basic distinctions in European integration theory is that between 'negative integration' and 'positive integration', which points to the observation that European integration involves both market-making and market-correcting policies (Scharpf, 1996, 1999). Negative integration follows the rationale of the common market and has a deregulatory or 'market-making' nature (Scharpf, 1996: 16-18; 1999: 50-71). By intervening against national barriers to the free movement of goods, persons, capital and services, negative integration greatly reduces the range of national policy choices and represents a fundamental loss of political control over the capitalist economy (Scharpf, 1999: 70-71). Positive integration, on the contrary, is an attempt to regain some power for the state vis-à-vis society and the market through re-regulation at the European level. The unwanted side-effects from liberalization processes, in particular from the free movement of goods, persons, capital and services, demand a certain level of re-regulation at the European level. Positive integration is hence 'market-shaping' because it tries to intervene in the economy and involves a broader institutional adaptation at the domestic level to a specific European model (Scharpf, 1999: 45).⁴ It takes place when European directives, regulations or soft instruments like the open method of coordination (OMC) prescribe or encourage a new institutional model at the domestic level to regulate in such areas as consumer protection, environmental policy, or safety at work.

Others have added a third, ideational or 'framing', type of European

³ For a more elaborate typology of European integration, particularly for the field of immigration policies, see Vink (2002b).

⁴ Positive integration can also be 'market-making' to the extent that it tries to harmonize divergent national product standards in order to eliminate existing non-tariff barriers to trade (Scharpf, 1999: 45).

integration that tries to set norms in areas where 'the underlying conflicts of interest between the Member States only allows it to adopt policies which are vague and more or less symbolic' (Knill and Lehmkuhl, 2002: 259; cf. Lavenex, 2001). They rightfully point to the idea that Europeanization is not necessarily restricted to complying with EU regulations or transposing and implementing EU directives. Albeit surely less powerful, as Knill and Lehmkuhl (2002: 258) are keen to admit, Europeanization could proceed equally well through the framing of domestic beliefs and expectations. Domestic transformation also manifests itself in beliefs of domestic political actors or in reconfigured domestic discourses. In contrast with Knill and Lehmkuhl who denote it as a third distinct mechanism of Europeanization, however, this can perhaps better be viewed as a second dimension in our typology. This means that European policies can be distinguished not only by being market-making or market-correcting, but also by being 'strong' or 'weak'. European railways policies is an excellent example of 'weak' negative integration that, it seems, can nonetheless have a significant impact (Knill and Lehmkuhl, 2002: 272-275; see also Risse, 1999). A good example of 'weak' positive integration with a substantial domestic impact, on the other hand, would be the Bologna Declaration on the European Space for Higher Education (cf. Trondal, 2002: 11-12).⁵ This non-binding declaration apparently was an important inspiration for transformation of European higher education systems, as exemplified by the introduction of the Bachelor/Master system in The Netherlands in 2002.

	Negative (Deregulatory)	Positive (Regulatory)
Strong	<i>e.g. Competition Policy</i>	<i>e.g. Environmental Policy</i>

⁵ Joint Declaration of the European Ministers of Education convened in Bologna on the 19th of June 1999, see <http://europa.eu.int/comm/education/socrates/erasmus/bologna.pdf>

(binding)		
Weak (non-binding)	<i>e.g. Railways Policy</i>	<i>e.g. Higher Education Policy</i>

Figure 1. A Typology of European Integration

These two dimensions of positive vs. negative integration and strong vs. weak integration analytically lead to four different types of European integration (see Figure 1). Obviously this is an analytical distinction and empirically we might see that the line between strong and weak integration is not a clear-cut one as it is often unclear to what extent European provisions truly provide a binding constraint on domestic policies. Also, most European policy fields are probably characterized by a mixture of negative and positive integration (cf. Knill and Lehmkuhl, 2002: 257). The case of European immigration policies illustrates these mixed Europeanization dynamics (Vink, 2002). Focusing on the dominant patterns of European integration, however, should provide a better understanding of the range of Europeanization in that field.

7. What Does It Do To Us?

Now that we have roughly characterized the core dynamics of European integration, we need to proceed to the logical next step in this book on Europeanization and answer the question 'how Europe matters?' (Knill and Lehmkuhl, 1999). In other words, knowing that there are European policies, rules and norms (formal or informal; legally binding or non-binding), how do these actually affect domestic politics and policies? For answers to this question, scholars of Europeanization have almost without exception reverted to the broad spectrum of theories that fall under the umbrella of the so-called 'new institutionalism'. One might even go so far as to say that the research agenda of Europeanization as such exemplifies the institutionalist turn in political science

of the 1980s and 1990s (Hix and Goetz, 2000: 18; cf. Börzel and Risse, 2001; Bulmer and Lequesne, 2001; Olsen, 2001).

Institutional approaches can be characterized most concisely by the notion that 'institutions matter'. Institutions are classically understood as the formal rules, standard operating procedures and organizations of government. In its 'new' understanding, however, an institution also encompasses informal norms, routines and conventions. The seemingly banal claim that institutions matter and influence relevant political behavior must be understood primarily as a reaction to post-war behavioralism and rational choice that approach politics from a rather atomized conception of the individual. Moreover, as it is through the actions of individuals that institutions have an effect on political outcomes, new institutionalists need to answer the question *how* institutions affect the behavior of individuals (e.g. March and Olsen, 1984, 1989; Hall and Taylor, 1996; Aspinwall and Schneider, 2000).

There are basically two kinds of responses to this question: a cultural and a calculus approach. The cultural approach 'emphasizes the extent to which individuals turn to established routines or familiar patterns of behaviour to attain their purposes.' In this approach, institutions 'affect the very identities, self-images and preferences of the actors' (Hall and Taylor, 1996: 939). Political behavior is explained largely on the basis of what has been termed a logic of appropriateness (March and Olson, 1998: 9). Such a 'thick' understanding of institutions contrasts with a much more 'thin' logic of expected consequences where individuals act strategically to realize their preferences (March and Olson, 1998: 7). This logic of action is coined a calculus approach because institutions have an impact 'by altering the expectations an actor has about the actions that others are likely to take in response to or simultaneously with his own action' (Hall and Taylor, 1996: 939). Individual action can then be explained at least partly exogenous to institutions as only strategic behavior –but neither identities nor preferences– of actors are altered by the larger institutional setting in which

action takes place.

The thick and thin understandings of institutions, or the corresponding cultural and calculus logic of action, result in what generally is acknowledged as two contrasting strains of new institutionalism: sociological and rational institutionalism.⁶ When connecting these new institutionalisms with the study of Europeanization we need to come to grips with two problems. The first question problematizes the compatibility of both strains of institutionalism. There are those who argue that the logic of appropriateness and the logic of consequentialism may go together perfectly well (March and Olsen, 1998; Börzel and Risse, 2001). What, however, would such a synthetic model imply in our empirical case, and how useful is it? And, second, the institutionalist focus does not entail a teleology of European integration (Bulmer, 1998: 368). Hence the conclusions of this study will necessarily be modest in the sense that they do not allow for a grand theory *à la* neo-functionalism, intergovernmentalism or multi-level governance. The question then raises: what does our institutional analysis of Europeanization tell us about the nature of European integration? These two questions will be answered in the next two sections.

8. Why Choose Between Thick And Thin Europeanization?

The contrast between appropriateness and consequentiality can best be explained by using an example, such as the impact of European citizenship norms on domestic nationality debates. Checkel (2001: 180) hypothesizes that the emergent consensus towards dual nationality within the COE in the case of Germany may either lead domestic actors to abandon the dominant ethnic

⁶ Somewhat surprisingly, Hall and Taylor (1996) see the two approaches as variants of historical institutionalism. This discrepancy has been noted also by others: 'Although offered as a way of differentiating between positions within historical institutionalism, the distinction between calculus and cultural approaches is precisely that between rational choice and sociological institutionalisms' (Hay and Wincott, 1998: 952).

conception of German nationality, or it may constrain the possibility to stick to the traditional model without actually affecting the given preferences. Even when at the moment there is only a limited Europeanization of domestic citizenship policy due to the tentativeness of the emergent European norms (Checkel, 2001: 195-197; cf. Vink, 2001), both thick *and* thin institutionalism do provide contrasting ways to theoretically approach the question how Europe *could* matter.

Having established that sociological and rational institutionalism offer two contrasting accounts of how Europe matters, the question rises how both pathways relate to each other. Do they offer explanations for different phases of domestic change or are they mutually exclusive? Although the jury is still out on this question, the first 'synthetic' view seems to be favorite among scholars of Europeanization (e.g. Börzel and Risse, 2000: 13; Checkel, 2001: 196; Knill and Lehmkuhl, 2002; but note the outspoken choice for a sociological institutionalism of Risse *et al*, 2001: 15). This consensus goes back to March and Olsen's (1998: 952) notion that each political action probably involves elements of appropriateness and consequentiality. 'Political actors are constituted both by their interests, by which they evaluate their expected consequences, and by the rules embedded in their identities and political institutions. They calculate consequences and follow rules, and the relationship between the two is often subtle.'

Notwithstanding its intuitive appeal, this synthetic position might perhaps be too ecumenical from a theoretical perspective. A parsimonious account of Europeanization should after all not conceal the great discrepancy between creating, or making the best of, new European opportunity structures (calculus) and adopting a new set of preferences, or even a new identity (cultural). There is quite a difference between the opportunities and constraints of European immigration policies for domestic actors, on the one hand, and adopting a 'post-national' way of thinking about migrant inclusion, on the other. Hence an important task of empirical studies would be to determine the *relative*

weight of cultural and calculus approaches in explaining Europeanization or domestic resilience, for that matter (Hix and Goetz, 2000: 18-20).

9. What Does It Tell Us About European Integration?

Perhaps one of the most obvious shortcomings of the research agenda of Europeanization, is its failure to relate to the traditional integration literature. To an extent this is understandable from its 'domestic politics' perspective that contrasts with the classic approach to European integration, as explained earlier. A comparativist's perspective does indeed shed a necessarily different light on European integration (Hix, 1994, 1998; cf. Gourevitch, 1978). Yet, apart from sometimes focusing too much on technical implementation details, scholars of Europeanization run the risk of missing the bigger picture by over-concentrating on the differences in processes of change across European countries. Accordingly we need to remind ourselves of the key questions that are at stake, and hypothesize how our results might relate to the 'grand theories' of European integration.

It hardly needs reminding that the traditional unit of analysis in world politics –the national state– is increasingly challenged or 'hollowed out' by processes of globalization, internationalization or regionalization (Rhodes, 1994). The case of the European Union is one of the most advanced instances where nation-states work towards an 'ever closer union' (EC Treaty, Preamble) and seemingly become ever more porous. In questioning the state of the state, therefore, the research agenda of Europeanization first of all responds to the general concern of 'unit variation' in contemporary political science (Kahler, 2002). The key task at hand is to measure more completely the degree to which state porosity currently prevails.

More specifically on the European case, the viability of the sovereign state as such has been in question since the early days of post-war European economic cooperation. Although the endpoint of the integration process has never been a

univocal 'United States of Europe', even a quasi-federal trajectory would indeed signify the beginning of the end of the nation-state as the dominant unit for political organization. Jean Monnet for example, the first President of the High Authority of the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC), advocated supranational competencies only in certain economic sectors, but not without seeing the potential for further integration (e.g. Harryvan *et al*, 2001: 268-273). Such 'spillover' from limited to wider economic cooperation forms the core of the so-called neo-functionalist theories of European integration (Haas, 1958; Lindberg, 1963). These theories are functionalist to the extent that they acknowledge that specific goals, such as exchange rate stability, can sometimes only be achieved by taking further actions, such as wider monetary cooperation (Rosamond, 2000: 60). The hollowing out of the state in this model is more or less preordained by the fact that member states are 'resolved to ensure the economic and social progress of their countries by common action to eliminate the barriers which divide Europe' (EC Treaty, Preamble).

With regard to the logic of institutionalization, neo-functionalism and its contemporary counterpart of supranational governance underline the importance of transnational activities. 'Where cross-border activities are of increasing importance, we expect to find the creation and growth of supranational governance. (...) Rising levels of cross-border transactions generate demand for EC rules and dispute resolution' (Stone Sweet and Sandholtz, 1997: 311; cf. Sandholtz and Stone Sweet, 1998). Although supranational theories do not necessarily preclude actor-centered strains of institutionalism (see e.g. Pierson, 1996), they do tend to emphasize the broader cultural environment in which decisions are being made. European organizations and rules are increasingly taken for granted and structure the behavior of national actors. Hence we might connect those 'thicker' forms of Europeanization, as hypothesized by sociological institutionalism, to supranational theories of European integration.

A contrasting model of European integration is provided by intergovernmentalist theory. Here Europeanization is viewed as contributing not so much to the demise, but rather to the rescue of the nation-state. 'The surrenders of national sovereignty after 1950 were one aspects of the successful reassertion of the nation-state as the basic organizational entity of Europe (Milward, 1994: 438). According to Moravcsik (1993a: 474), proponent of so-called liberal intergovernmentalism, 'the EC can be analyzed as a successful international regime designed to manage economic interdependence through negotiated policy co-ordination.' What matters for understanding the European Union are the preferences and power of its member states because these explain the choices of sovereign governments to shift decision-making powers to European institutions. By implication, because member state government at all times remain in the driving seat, European integration is by no means preordained to a federal 'ever closer' union. The persistence of national power, on the contrary, shows the unlikelihood of the disappearance of the nation-state (see Moravcsik, 1998 for a fuller account).

Looking at the domestic impact of European integration in more detail, intergovernmentalists depart from two-level theories where national executives are simultaneously involved in international negotiations and bargaining with domestic interest groups (Evans *et al*, 1993). Governments, or powerful groups within the executive, can achieve more optimal outcomes at the international level if they convincingly show that their hands are tied by domestic commitments. More important, domestically, it allows them to avoid the blame for unpopular policies by pointing at international package deals and the need to live up to international obligations (Putnam, 1988; Hosli, 2001). Generally one could argue that European integration redistributes domestic political influence in favor of the executive because of shifting control over agenda-setting, altering decision-making procedures, informational asymmetries and new justifications for domestic policies. National executives are increasingly able to 'cut slack' and

loosen the constraints imposed by legislatures, interest groups and other domestic actors (Moravcsik, 1994). By pointing at the manifestation of Europeanization in changing opportunity structures, where calculating actors strategically adapt to new circumstances, the intergovernmentalist theory of integration clearly connects to the rational strain of new institutionalism.

10. Where Do We Go From Here?

If anything, the foregoing discussion of the major questions related to the new research agenda of Europeanization signifies the need for (1) conceptual clarification, (2) explicit theorizing and empirical testing, and (3) 'scientific unity'. First, when defining what Europeanization is we should clarify the difference with other contiguous terms. By doing so, and if Europeanization is to become more than just a 'fashionable term' (Olsen, 2001), it is always (to a certain extent) a process of domestic change caused (somehow) by European integration. This definition forces us to focus primarily (but not completely) at the national level and to find out to what extent and why national politics is affected by European developments.

Second, in order to develop our research agenda beyond the scope of merely technical implementation studies it is of crucial importance to be as explicit as possible in why we expect domestic change (or not) in a certain area. I have argued that particularly the new institutionalist theories are suitable to account for domestic change, and that preferably contrasting hypotheses should be developed from the sociological and rational strains of institutionalism. Such propositions should subsequently be 'tested' as rigorously as possible where the extent of change in identities and strategies of domestic actors is crucial in deciding between what might be called thick and thin Europeanization.

Finally, and notwithstanding the specific 'domestic politics' perspective of the Europeanization research agenda, we need not lose out of sight the bigger question of the transformation of the nation-state that has been at the basis of

classic integration theories. I have argued that at a first quick glance there seems ample room to make a connection between thick Europeanization and supranational theories, on the one hand, and thin Europeanization and intergovernmental theories, on the other. Not only would that allow for more 'scientific unity' between scholars of Europeanization who at the moment seem to be dispersed along the continuum between international relations (more European-focused) and comparative politics (more nationally-focused). It could also shed some new light on old questions.

References

- Aspinwall, M. and G. Schneider (2000) 'Same menu, separate tables: The institutionalist turn in political science and the study of European integration.' *European Journal of Political Research*, Vol. 38, pp. 1-36.
- Börzel, T. (1999) 'Towards Convergence in Europe? Institutional Adaptation to Europeanization in German and Spain.' *Journal of Common Market Studies*, Vol. 37, No. 4, pp. 573-596.
- Börzel, T. and Risse, T. (2000) 'When Europe Hits Home: Europeanization and Domestic Change.' *European Integration Online Papers* Vol. 4, No. 15, <http://eiop.or.at/eiop/texte/2000-015a.htm>.
- Börzel, T. (2002) 'Pace-Setting, Foot-Dragging, and Fence-Sitting: Member State Responses to Europeanization.' *Journal of Common Market Studies*, Vol. 40, No. 2, pp. 193-214.
- Bulmer, S. (1998) 'New institutionalism and the governance of the Single European Market.' *Journal of European Public Policy*, Vol. 5, No. 3, pp. 365-386.
- Bulmer, S. and C. Lequesne (2001) 'New Perspectives on EU-Member State Relationships.' Paper for the ECSA biennial conference, May 31-June 2, 2001, Madison, Wisconsin.
- Checkel, J.T. (2001) 'The Europeanization of Citizenship?' In Green Cowles, Caporaso and Risse (eds), pp. 180-197.
- De Rooij, R. (2002) 'The Impact of the European Union on local government in the Netherlands.' *Journal of European Public Policy*, Vol. 9, No. 3, pp. 447-467.
- Dimitrova, A. and Steunenberg, B. (2000) 'The Search for Convergence of National Policies in the European Union: An Impossible Quest?' *European Union Politics*, Vol. 1, No. 2, pp. 201-226.
- Evans, P.B. (1993) 'Building an Integrative Approach to International and Domestic Politics: Reflections and Conclusions.' In Evans *et al*, pp. 397-430.
- Evans, P.B., H.K. Jacobson, and R.D. Putnam, eds (1993) *Double-Edged Diplomacy: International Bargaining and Domestic Politics* (Berkeley etc.: University of California Press).
- Falkner, G. (2001) 'The Europeanisation of Austria: Misfit, Adaptation and Controversies.' *European Integration Online Papers*, Vol. 5, No. 13, <http://eiop.or.at/eiop/texte/2001-013a.htm>.
- Freeman, G.P. and Ögelman, N. (1998) 'Homeland citizenship policies and the status of third country nationals in the European Union.' *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, Vol.24, no.4, pp. 769-788.
- Garrett, G. (1992) 'International cooperation and institutional choice: The European Community's internal market.' *International Organization*, Vol. 46(2), pp. 533-560.
- Goetz, K.H. (2001) 'Making sense of post-communist central administration: modernization, Europeanization or Latinization?' *Journal of European Public Policy*, Vol. 8, No. 6, pp. 1032-1051.
- Goetz, K. and S. Hix, eds (2000) 'Europeanised Politics? European Integration and National Political Systems.' Special issue of *West European Politics*, Vol. 23, No. 4.
- Gourevitch, P. (1978) 'The second image reversed: the international sources of domestic politics.' *International Organization*, Vol. 32, No. 4, pp. 881-911.
- Grabbe, H. (2001) 'How does Europeanization affect CEE governance? Conditionality, diffusion and diversity.' *Journal of European Public Policy*, Vol. 8(6), pp. 1013-1031.

- Green Cowles, M., J. Caporaso and T. Risse, eds (2001) *Transforming Europe: Europeanization and Domestic Change* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press).
- Haas, E. (1964) *Beyond the Nation-State: Functionalism and International Organization* (Stanford: Stanford University Press).
- Hall, P. and R. Taylor (1996) 'Political Science and the Three New Institutionalisms.' *Political Science*, Vol. XLIV, pp. 936-957.
- Hanf, K. and Soetendorp, B. (eds) (1998) *Adapting to European Integration - Small States and the European Union* (London and New York: Longman).
- Harryvan, A.G. et al, eds (2001) *Voor Nederland en Europa: Politici en ambtenaren over het Nederlandse Europabeleid en de Europese integratie, 1945-1975* (Den Haag: Instituut voor Nederlandse Geschiedenis).
- Haverland, M. (2000) 'National Adaptation to European Integration: The Importance of Institutional Veto Points.' *Journal of Public Policy*, Vol. 20, No. 1, pp. 83-103.
- Hix, S. (1994) 'The Study of the European Community: The Challenge to Comparative Politics.' *West European Politics*, Vol. 17, No. 1, pp. 1-30.
- Hix, S. (1998) 'The Study of the European Union II: The 'New Governance' Agenda and Its Rival.' *Journal of European Public Policy*, Vol. 5, No. 1, pp. 38-65.
- Hix, S. and K. Goetz (2000) 'Introduction: European Integration and National Political Systems.' *West European Politics*, Vol. 23, No. 4, pp. 1-26.
- Hosli, M. O. (2001) 'The creation of the European economic and monetary union (EMU): intergovernmental negotiations and two-level games.' *Journal of European Public Policy*, Vol. 7, No. 5, pp. 744-766.
- Kahler, M. (2002) 'The State of the State in World Politics'. In Katzelnelson and Milner, pp. 56-83.
- Kassim, H., B.G. Peters and V. Wright, eds (2000) *The National Co-ordination of EU Policy - The Domestic Level* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- Katznelson, I. and H. Milner, eds (2002) *Political Science: State of the Discipline* (New York/London: W.W. Norton).
- Knill, C. (1998) 'European Policies: The Impact of National Administrative Traditions.' *Journal of Public Policy*, Vol. 18, No. 1, pp. 1-28.
- Knill, C. and Lehmkuhl, D. (2002) 'The national impact of European Union regulatory policy: Three Europeanization mechanisms.' *European Journal of Political Research*, Vol. 41, No. 2, pp. 255-280.
- Ladrech, R. (2002) 'Europeanization and Political Parties: Towards a Framework for Analysis.' *Party Politics*, Vol. 8, No. 4, pp. 389-403.
- Ladrech, R. (1994) 'Europeanization of Domestic Politics and Institutions: The Case of France.' *Journal of Common Market Studies*, Vol. 32, No. 1, pp. 69-88.
- Lavenex, S. (2001) 'The Europeanization of Refugee Policies: Normative Challenges and Institutional Legacies'. *Journal of Common Market Studies*, Vol. 39, No. 5, pp. 851-974.
- Mach, A. et al (2002) 'Economic regulatory reforms in Switzerland: Adjustment without European integration or how rigidities become flexible.' *Journal of European Public Policy*, forthcoming.
- Mair, P. (2000) 'The Limited Impact of Europe on National Party Systems.' *West European Politics*, Vol. 23, No. 4, pp. 27-51.
- March, J. and J. Olsen (1998) 'The Institutional Dynamics of International Political Orders.' *International Organization*, Vol. 52, No. 4, pp. 943-969.

- March, J. and J. Olsen (1984) 'The New Institutionalism: Organizational Factors in Political Life.' *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 78, pp. 734-749.
- Marks, G., Scharpf, F., Schmitter, P. and Streeck, W. (1996) *Governance in the European Union* (London: SAGE).
- Marks, G. and McAdam, D. (1996) 'Social Movements and the Changing Structure of Political Opportunity in the European Union.' In Marks, Scharpf, Schmitter and Streeck, pp. 95-120.
- Mény, Y., P. Muller and J-L. Quermonne, eds (1996) *Adjusting to Europe: The impact of the European Union on national institutions and policies* (London and New York: Routledge).
- Milward, A.S. (1994) *The European Rescue of the Nation-State* (London: Routledge).
- Moravcsik, A. (1993a) 'Preferences and Power in the European Community: A Liberal Intergovernmentalist Approach.' *Journal of Common Market Studies*, Vol. 31, No. 4, pp. 473-524.
- Moravcsik, A. (1993b) 'Introduction: Integrating International and Domestic Theories of International Bargaining.' In Evans *et al* pp. 3-42.
- Moravcsik, A. (1994) 'Why the European Community Strengthens the State: Domestic Politics and International Cooperation.' *Center for European Studies Working Paper Series* (Harvard University), No. 52.
- Moravcsik, A. (1998) *The Choice for Europe: Social Purpose and State Power from Messina to Maastricht* (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press).
- Moravcsik, A. (1999) 'A New Statecraft? Supranational Entrepreneurs and International Cooperation.' *International Organization*, Vol. 53, No. 2, pp. 267-306.
- Olson, J. (2001) 'The Many Faces of Europeanization.' *ARENA Working Papers*, WP 01/2.
- Pierson, P. (1996) 'The Path to European Integration: A Historical Institutional Analysis.' *Comparative Political Studies*, Vol. 29, No. 2, pp. 123-163.
- Pollack, M. (1996) 'The New Institutionalism and EC Governance: The Promise and Limits of Institutional Analysis.' *Governance*, Vol. 9, No 4, pp. 429-458.
- Putnam, R. (1988) 'Diplomacy and domestic politics: the logic of two-level games.' *International Organization* Vol. 42, No. 3, pp. 427-460.
- Radaelli, C. (2000) 'Whither Europeanization? Concept Stretching and Substantive Change'. *European Integration Online Papers*, Vol. 4, No. 8, <http://eiop.or.at/eiop/texte/2000-008a.htm>.
- Raunio, T. and S. Hix (2000) 'Backbenchers Learn to Fight Back: European Integration and Parliamentary Government.' *West European Politics*, Vol. 23, No. 4, pp. 142-168.
- Risse, T. (1999) Comment no. 1 to Knill and Lehmkuhl, 'How Europe Matters'. *European Integration Online Papers*, Vol. 3, No. 7, <http://eiop.or.at/eiop/comment/1999-007c.htm>.
- Risse, T., Green Cowles, M. and Caporaso, J. (2001) 'Europeanization and Domestic Change: Introduction.' In Green Cowles *et al*, pp. 1-20.
- Rometsch, D. and W. Wessels, eds (1996) *The European Union and the Member States: Towards Institutional Fusion?* (Manchester: Manchester University Press).
- Sandholtz, W. and A. Stone Sweet, eds (1998) *European Integration and Supranational Governance* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- Sbragia, A. (2001) 'Italy Pays for Europe: Political Leadership, Political Choice, and Institutional Adaptation.' In Green Cowles *et al*, pp. 79-96.

- Scharpf, F. W. (1988) 'The Joint-Decision Trap: Lessons from German federalism and European integration'. *Public Administration*, Vol. 66, pp. 239-278.
- Scharpf, F. (1996) 'Negative and Positive Integration in the Political Economy of European Welfare States.' In Marks *et al* pp. 15-39.
- Scharpf, F. (1999) *Governing in Europe: Effective and Democratic* (Oxford University Press).
- Stone Sweet, A. and W. Sandholtz (1997) 'European Integration and Supranational Governance.' *Journal of European Public Policy*, Vol. 4, No. 3, pp. 297-317.
- Trondal, J. (2002) 'The Europeanisation of Research and Higher educational Policies: Some Reflections.' *European Integration Online Papers*, Vol. 6, No. 12, <http://eiop.or.at/eiop/texte/2002-012a.htm>.
- Vink, M. (2001) 'The Limited Europeanization of Domestic Citizenship Policy: Evidence from the Netherlands.' *Journal of Common Market Studies*, Vol. 39(5), pp. 875-896.
- Vink, M. (2002a) 'European Immigration Politics' (Review Article). *West European Politics*, Vol. 25, No. 3, pp. 205-212.
- Vink, M. (2002b) 'Negative and Positive Integration in European Immigration Policies.' *European Integration Online Papers*, Vol. 6, No. 13, <http://eiop.or.at/eiop/texte/2002-013a.htm>.
- Zeff, E. E. and E.B. Pirro, eds (2001) *The European Union and the Member States: Cooperation, Coordination and Compromise* (Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers).