

On: 24 September 2013, At: 01:06

Publisher: Routledge

Informa Ltd Registered in England and Wales Registered Number: 1072954 Registered office: Mortimer House, 37-41 Mortimer Street, London W1T 3JH, UK



## East European Politics

Publication details, including instructions for authors and subscription information:

<http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/fjcs21>

### The eastern dimension of the European neighbourhood policy: practices, instruments and social structures

Elena A. Korosteleva<sup>a</sup>, Michal Natorksi<sup>b</sup> & Lúcia Simão<sup>c d</sup>

<sup>a</sup> School of Politics and International Relations, University of Kent, Canterbury, UK

<sup>b</sup> European Neighbourhood Chair, College of Europe, Natolin Campus, Warsaw, Poland

<sup>c</sup> Faculty of Economics, University of Coimbra, Coimbra, Portugal

<sup>d</sup> Centre for Social Studies, University of Coimbra, Coimbra, Portugal

Published online: 24 Sep 2013.

To cite this article: Elena A. Korosteleva, Michal Natorksi & Lúcia Simão (2013) The eastern dimension of the European neighbourhood policy: practices, instruments and social structures, *East European Politics*, 29:3, 257-272

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/21599165.2013.807801>

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

Taylor & Francis makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of all the information (the "Content") contained in the publications on our platform. However, Taylor & Francis, our agents, and our licensors make no representations or warranties whatsoever as to the accuracy, completeness, or suitability for any purpose of the Content. Any opinions and views expressed in this publication are the opinions and views of the authors, and are not the views of or endorsed by Taylor & Francis. The accuracy of the Content should not be relied upon and should be independently verified with primary sources of information. Taylor and Francis shall not be liable for any losses, actions, claims, proceedings, demands, costs, expenses, damages, and other liabilities whatsoever or howsoever caused arising directly or indirectly in connection with, in relation to or arising out of the use of the Content.

This article may be used for research, teaching, and private study purposes. Any substantial or systematic reproduction, redistribution, reselling, loan, sub-licensing, systematic supply, or distribution in any form to anyone is expressly forbidden. Terms &

Conditions of access and use can be found at <http://www.tandfonline.com/page/terms-and-conditions>

## The eastern dimension of the European neighbourhood policy: practices, instruments and social structures

Elena A. Korosteleva<sup>a\*</sup>, Michal Natorski<sup>b</sup> and Licinia Simão<sup>c,d</sup>

<sup>a</sup>*School of Politics and International Relations, University of Kent, Canterbury, UK;* <sup>b</sup>*European Neighbourhood Chair, College of Europe, Natolin Campus, Warsaw, Poland;* <sup>c</sup>*Faculty of Economics, University of Coimbra, Coimbra, Portugal;* <sup>d</sup>*Centre for Social Studies, University of Coimbra, Coimbra, Portugal*

(Received 29 May 2012; final version received 23 November 2012)

The European Union (EU) continually searches for more effective policy towards its eastern neighbours, which is reflected in the ongoing adaptation of its existing approaches, discourses and policy strategies to the new challenges of its external environment. In order to understand the complexity and limitations of the EU framework under the European neighbourhood policy and the eastern partnership initiative – that is, to consider the interface between policy instruments, institutional structures and multiple agents – one needs to adopt an original analytical perspective of *practices* to comprehensively assess the policies' outcomes. With this in mind, this issue sets to discern patterns of social practices between the EU and its eastern neighbours, and examine how these relations guide agents' interactions in various policy areas. This introduction outlines the theoretical framework synergising the three fundamental concepts – of practices, policy instruments and social structures – that have predicated research for this issue. It also outlines the structure and main arguments of the individual case-studies which inform the issue's conceptual framework.

**Keywords:** European neighbourhood policy; eastern partnership; practices; policy instruments; social structures; EU governance

### Introduction

We have moved forward in political association, in economic integration, in visa liberalisation, we start sectoral cooperation and we are strengthening the support for the civil society . . . But nothing from *our efforts and policies* towards the Neighbourhood can replace the reforms [needed in] the Eastern [region]. (Füle 2012, emphasis added)

The eastern partnership initiative (EaP) has come a long way in a short time. Proposed by the Polish and Swedish governments in 2008 (Eastern Partnership 2008), it sought to become “a specific Eastern dimension of the European Neighbourhood Policy” (Council of the European Union 2009, 6; Polish-Swedish Initiative 2008) to allow for regional focus, and further policy differentiation. It was officially launched at the Prague Summit a year later, having enjoyed full ceremonial endorsement of all the partner countries and European Union (EU) member states.

More specifically, the EaP was devised to pursue a novel two-track approach of bi- and multi-lateral relations with EU's eastern neighbours – through new contractual agreements, joint policy platforms, flagship initiatives and a variety of supportive technical and financial instruments – to ensure the partner countries' closer approximation towards the EU and to “offer the *maximum*

---

\*Corresponding author. Email: [e.korosteleva@kent.ac.uk](mailto:e.korosteleva@kent.ac.uk), [eak8@kent.ac.uk](mailto:eak8@kent.ac.uk)

possible ... [by] bringing visible benefits for the citizens of each country” (Commission of the European Communities 2008, 2–3).

Despite the complex *apparatus* of expanded resources and instruments, the year 2010, however, proved rather challenging for the implementation of the European neighbourhood policy (ENP) and its eastern dimension in particular. Not only did it coincide with the global financial crisis, but also with the EU post-Lisbon restructuring (including the launch of the External Action Service) and the increasing instability on the EU’s southern periphery. More notably, it failed to register any reinvigorated sense of commitment on the partners’ side (European Commission 2010), instead often witnessing their increasing oscillation towards Russia. The policy seemed to have needed further evaluation in order to offer a more coherent and robust approach to save its dwindling credibility in the region (Whitman and Wolff 2010; Korosteleva 2011).

A more reflexive iteration of the ENP strategy, inclusive of the eastern region, was communicated by the Commission in May 2011 (European Commission 2011). The revised version comprised an extensive set of documents encompassing countries’ progress reports, a sectoral and regional progress overview, and the ENP’s updated medium-term programme. *A New Response* from the EU clearly envisaged a structural shift towards more partnership, to make the relationship more *mutually beneficial*, and premised on a “much higher level of differentiation allowing each partner country to develop its links with the EU as far as its own aspirations, needs and capacities allow” (European Commission 2011, 1–2). The new approach also pledged “to provide mechanisms and instruments fit to deliver these objectives” (European Commission 2011, 2), and reiterated the importance of a *more for more* principle, to be consummated in daily practices and emergent social structures of the partner states.

Indeed, a new and multilevel governance structure of the EaP has now become apparent. The ENP’s eastern dimension currently operates through a complex configuration of bi- and multilateral policy instruments, articulated by and reflected in the existing or emergent social structures.

In particular, the EaP’s bilateral track now hosts two new initiatives – comprehensive institution building (CIB) and pilot regional development programmes (PRDPs), being contractually premised on association agreements (AAs, now broken down into annual agendas) and deep and comprehensive free trade agreements (DCFTAs). The EaP’s multilateral track is constantly evolving to accommodate four thematic platforms – of democracy and good governance, economic integration and convergence, energy security and contact between people – and to correlate them with five flagship initiatives.<sup>1</sup> This is advanced by individually tailored roadmaps and further supplemented by a range of regional activities, including the Black Sea Synergy initiative, Interstate Oil and Gas Transport to Europe (INOGATE) (energy initiative) and Transport Corridor Europe-Caucasus-Asia (TRACECA) (transport initiative). Technical and financial instruments also abound, often co-opting international stakeholders to ensure success, legitimacy and credibility of the EU’s engagement with the eastern region. These policy instruments are duly realised through existing or emergent social structures ranging from regular political summits to mobilising “all strands of society” (European Commission 2011, 2) – the EURONEST Parliamentary Assembly, the civil society forum (CSF), the conference of regional and local authorities (CORLEAP), and the Sopot Business Forum.

Nevertheless, as the article’s opening statement by Commissioner Füle explicitly suggests, the EU efforts alone, now involving an elaborate agency and expanded capabilities, are not sufficient if they are not mutually reciprocated through the respective discourses, actions and structures – the *practices* – to gauge the policy’s success on both sides. A far more complex and integrative investigation is needed, of *practices* – from conceptual and empirical perspectives – as performed by social agents – to ascertain whether the burgeoning policy instruments adequately address the needs of relevant stakeholders, and to examine what kind of new patterned behaviours and social order emerge as a result of these daily intertwining practices.

The task of this special issue is *not* to proliferate case-specific or issue-focused theories, but rather to offer a *synergising* perspective on EU's *practices* in the neighbourhood as an integrative and dynamic continuum of perceptions and actions across the field. Hence, this issue will offer an examination of the set of *practices*, as implemented through the use of *policy instruments* and subsequently embedded into the existing/emergent social *structures* that frame the EU-neighbours' relations. To gauge the success of the policy's implementation this collection of geographical and thematic case studies, joined by the overarching concept of *practices*, puts forward a structured reflection on the discourses, processes and their meanings, which occur daily between the EU and its eastern neighbourhood. This study's principal aims are to discern *patterns of social practices* which guide the agents' interactions in different policy areas; to explore the origin and effect of these practices (the role of dominant discourses, logistical imbalances, deliberate strategies, etc.); and to explicate the nature of the emerging social structures being established in the eastern region. Drawing on the earlier works of the "practices turn" in International Relations (Neumann 2002; Adler and Pouliot 2011) this approach is distinctive from other constructivist undertakings as it allows to synergise the meanings of social actions (through the focus on agents and instruments), and their structural extensions (through the focus on emergent structures) across geo- and bio-political localities of the EU and the neighbourhood.

In particular, building upon the existing scholarship, the contributions to this special issue place the *practices* of EU vis-à-vis its neighbours relations in a broader context of binaries – including contradictions and dilemmas of inclusiveness/exclusiveness, cooperation/conflict, hierarchy/network and governance/partnership – to offer an overview of the existing and emerging dynamics of interplay between the ENP/EaP's agency and its multiple agents. This introductory chapter, thus, will first outline the theoretical framework synergising the three fundamental concepts of practices, policy instruments and social structures. It will then discuss the arrangement and the main arguments of the individual case-studies which inform the conceptual framework of this issue.

### **The framework: the practices perspective on EU relations with neighbours**

This special issue embraces practices performed in connection to policy instruments and social structures which organise relations between the EU and its east European countries. What follows below is a brief outline of the three basic analytical concepts that inform the analysis of EU-eastern neighbours' relations hereon: practices, policy instruments and structures. In brief, our approach draws on international relations (IR), political sociology and public administration literature that conceives of *policy instruments* as a particular set of *practices* which shape the existing and emergent *social structures* of the EU-eastern neighbours' relations at different levels of analysis. This approach thus allows the disentanglement of EU practices (as initiated through policy instruments) from those of the neighbours (as embedded in their social structures) to offer a comparative overview of the effectiveness of EU governance in the eastern region.

After a brief discussion of the concept of practices, we then outline a taxonomy of ENP/EaP policy instruments and highlight some general patterns of the emergent social structures, which could be observed as a part of the daily dynamics in the EU-neighbours' relations.

### ***Practices as a set of policy instruments and emergent structures***

This special issue focuses on the *practices* of the EU foreign policy vis-à-vis the eastern neighbours. The practices perspective adopted in this issue considers "social actions" (Neumann 2002, 637), "competent performances" (Adler and Pouliot 2011, 4) and "routinized type of behaviour" (Reckwitz 2002, 249), emphasising the action of the agents involved in relations between the EU and its eastern neighbours. In particular, practices are defined as "socially meaningful patterns of

action which, in being performed more or less competently, simultaneously embody, act out, and possibly reify background knowledge and discourse in and on the material world” (Adler and Pouliot 2011, 4).<sup>2</sup> The concept of international practices as competent performance has two crucial aspects, central to the approach adopted in this issue: actions and their interpretation. The *performative* aspect of practices (action) relates to the process of “doing”, which are seen as regular occurrences over time and space, and which therefore repeat and reproduce certain behaviours and associated meanings. In order to perform practices competently, actors require certain practical skills premised upon their background knowledge and prior experience, which would “make what is done ‘self-evident’ or commonsensical” (Pouliot 2008, 258).<sup>3</sup> To be competent, practices should follow some common and generalised standards or rules of procedure (Navari 2011). Therefore, practices are also *interpretative* acts, which connect performances (actions) with their respective meanings, socially recognised as competent.

Recent research in the IR field noted a revived scholarly interest in the daily practices of international actors articulated by their structured and competent performances as part of their “doing” of international politics. Inspired by the general “social turn to practices” (Schatzki, Cetina, and von Savigny 2001), scholars working in this field are concerned with the question of “how world politics actually works”,<sup>4</sup> and treat such phenomena as war, balancing, deterrence, human rights protection or diplomacy as examples of international practices (Adler and Pouliot 2011). There are different conceptual and methodological approaches to understanding international practices. Some even argue that the latter neither offer a unique theoretical paradigm, nor signal any privileged methodological approach (Adler and Pouliot 2011). Rather, practices form “an entry point to the study of world politics”, a gateway to understanding actors’ performances and associated meanings, since they are equitable *objects* of analysis which could be rendered through various theoretical and methodological perspectives.

Despite the diversity of intellectual traditions and specific theories addressing international practices, they all converge on the point that international practices sustain world politics by way of reflecting dynamic processes of everyday “doing” in the sphere of human activity, and of ordering material and ideational references into continuous and stable social structures. In particular, this dimension of embedded or emergent patterns as a result of agents’ action and interaction is often overlooked in the study of international practices (Neumann and Pouliot 2011, 136). From this perspective, social structures are not exclusively determined by particular configurations of resources and actions (e.g. EU resources and actions towards the neighbours). They are seen as constructed through social interactions – *practices as interface* – since individual practices only become meaningful when they are *interpreted* and registered as “socially recognized forms of activity, done on the basis of what members learn from others, and capable of being done well or badly, correctly or incorrectly” (Barnes 2001, 19). Shared practices are neither ontologically unitary nor are they clusters of individual actions. They are invariably the consequence of competent actions by learned groupings acting socially towards a collective attainment. The shared practices are generated on every occasion “by agents concerned all the time to retain coordination and alignment with each other in order to bring them about” (Barnes 2001, 25). Practices performed individually become collective when shared knowledge provides meaning and purpose to their intentions (interpretative act); they become corporate when they are performed by the collective in unison (Adler and Pouliot 2011, 8). Therefore, communities of practice only originate around shared practices consisting of “people who are informally as well as contextually bound by a shared interest in learning and applying a common practice”, to attain mutually intended goals and reciprocal gains (Snyder in Adler 2008, 199). Consequently, these collective groupings around *performed practices* (actions) driven by a common interest and configuration of resources and goals, become regulated by the consented norms and rules, and in their orderly occurrences articulate *certain meanings* (interpretive

acts) and form particular *patterns*, which arrange agents, resources, instruments and actions into stable social structures.

### *Instruments of EU external action as practices*

The study of practices encompasses multiple international phenomena. This is both the strength of this analytical perspective as well as its challenge, since it can lead to an over-stretching of the approach and the inhibition of a meaningful dialogue between various realms of IR. For the purpose of this comparative study, our focus will be on practices that surround *policy instruments* as a means to facilitate actions in the EU-eastern neighbours' relations, and practices that refer to *social structures* as regulated patterns of competent interactions bound by agreed rules and norms.

#### *Defining instruments as practices*

A close relationship is observed to exist between practices and policy instruments indicating that instruments could also be viewed as material phenomena, i.e. technical devices stimulating a set of patterned activities configuring social relations (Balzacq 2008). Policy instruments might be considered as “anchoring” (Swidler 2001) or “general” (Hansen 2011) practices that aggregate particular practices to create their hierarchical constellations to govern interactions of different actors.<sup>5</sup> Policy instruments can be viewed as objects, which in their aggregation may refer to established or emergent patterns of governance. Simultaneously, each policy instrument may create their own subjectivity with a distinguishing domain of prevalent and subordinated actions. It is a matter of empirical analysis to unravel patterns of various practices – here seen as orderly actions – in order to establish whether they form intended patterns and articulate desired meanings to foster the emergence of new social structures.

The instruments of foreign policy are defined as “the forms of pressure and influence available to decision makers” (Brighi and Hill 2008).<sup>6</sup> However, this general definition does not reflect the complexity of issues inscribed in the policy instruments, inclusive of their logistical meaning to instigate actions. Therefore, in order to better connect practices with policy instruments a broader sociological perspective on *policy instruments* will be employed here:

[Policy instrument] is a device that is both technical and social, that organises specific social relations between the state and those it is addressed to, according to the representations and meaning it carries. It is a particular type of institution, a technical device with the generic purpose of carrying a concept of the politics/society relationship and sustained by a concept of regulations. (Lascoumes and Le Galès 2007, 4)

There are different mechanisms by which the EU determines policies towards its external milieu. They consist of a wide array of diplomatic and administrative means to facilitate relations between international actors. However, in contrast to this broader sociological understanding of policy instruments, the EU's external instruments have often been analysed from a formal (narrow) perspective of treaty provisions, hitherto premised on the the EU pillar structure (Smith 2003). As observed by Michael E. Smith, EU practices surrounding policy instruments may not necessarily correspond to and in fact, may extend far beyond the existing formal provisions of the EU governance structure:

The EU's repertoire of policy tools cannot be understood fully by examining treaty articles and formal institutional arrangements alone; the EU has managed in many cases to do more than we might otherwise expect by reading of EU treaty documents. (Smith 2005, 157)

The analysis of EU instruments for external action has progressively expanded to take into account “cross-pillar” practices, thus blurring the boundaries of the external/internal, political/social, and hierarchy/network; and connecting diverse actors from across the board into continuing and stable policy processes (Stetter 2004, 2007). New approaches emerged to interpret EU’s external actions as part of EU governance structures placing emphasis either on various modes of EU actions from the hierarchical governance (Gänzle 2009; Lavenex 2009) or networked partnership (Bechev and Nicolaidis 2010; Korosteleva 2012) perspectives; or more recently on evaluating EU modus operandi (apparatus of governance) from the perspective of governmentality (Foucault 2009; Joseph 2010; Kurki 2011; Merlingen 2011). The practices perspective complements these approaches, by providing a framework to understand the meaning of EU policy instruments and their ability to sustain shared practices and social structures.

### *Taxonomy of instruments as practices*

For the purpose of this issue, Whitman’s (1997) categorisation of EU’s policy instruments as practices of EU’s external action may be of particular utility. More specifically, Whitman distinguishes between procedural, transference, declaratory and overt instruments that functionally represent different foreign policy arenas of activities. These policy instruments reflect the whole gamut of EU practices vis-à-vis the eastern neighbourhood, and are detailed below.

In particular, *procedural instruments* refer to the institutionalised relationships, such as diplomatic relations and various agreements and activities with third countries. EU’s procedural instruments encompass administrative measures (agreements, initiatives, platforms) and diplomatic solutions including the recognition of other actors as subjects of international law or the suspension of relations in view of sanctions.<sup>7</sup> In the ENP/EaP context, EU’s diplomatic means remain restricted, given the soft nature of the ENP/EaP,<sup>8</sup> and the policy’s limited legitimacy in the region. Conversely, the administrative instruments have evolved considerably to reflect a complex nature of EU governance, and currently offer hierarchical and networked (horizontal) means of interactions. Notably, on the bilateral level, instruments have shifted from Action Plans to the new-type AAs and DCFTAs, which are also subject to various sectoral initiatives (visa liberalisation and mobility partnerships) principally undertaken under the roofing of CIB and PRDP and modelled on the EU cohesion policy (EEAS 2010). The multilateral dimension now involves four policy platforms – of (1) democracy, good governance and stability; (2) economic integration and convergence; (3) energy security and (4) contacts between people – each additionally hosting the whole range of flagship, sectoral, regional and local initiatives. In particular, platform 1 has identified a number of thematic panels focusing on administrative and institutional reforms, and fight against corruption and international crime; it also administers the Integrated Border Management initiative and regional activities of the European instrument for democracy and human rights. Platform 2 hosts panels focusing on SMEs, trade and regulation, environment and climate change thus also incorporating activities of the environmental governance flagship initiative. Platform 3 recently launched four procedural activities regulating energy security supply, efficiency, diversification and harmonisation. Platform 4 covers higher education and research; and is also subject to EU-level initiatives (as outlined by life-long learning programmes and various short-term pilot projects). PPRD-east and environmental governance flagship initiatives cut across all four platforms, and are supported by the framework of sectoral and regional cooperation (EuropeAid 2011).

*Transference instruments* refer to the relationships which denote positive transference of financial and technical assistance as well as negative financial and economic measures in the forms of sanctions or trade restrictions (embargoes, anti-dumping measures). In practice, the



positive transference instruments of external assistance financed from the EU budget constitute an important tool supporting EU political, economic and social objectives. Most of EU external financial assistance to the neighbourhood is administered by a single financial instrument, the European neighbourhood and partnership instrument (ENPI),<sup>9</sup> and managed by the Development and Cooperation Directorate General, EuropeAid, which funds around 90% of the bilateral/regional actions and contributes 10% towards cross-border cooperation (CBC) and Neighbourhood Investment Facility (a financial mechanism aimed at mobilising additional funding for regional and flagship initiatives).<sup>10</sup> The means for technical and financial assistance are constantly evolving to reflect a needs-based relationship between the EU and its neighbours. The regional assistance, for example, currently covers over 18 activities, including INOGATE, TRACECA, EU Border Assistance Mission to Moldova and Ukraine, Erasmus Mundus, Twinning, Technical Assistance and Information Exchange and Support for Improvement in Governance and Management.<sup>11</sup> Most recently, financial tools at the EU's disposal have diversified to include co-opted facilities for regional and national programmes (Council of Europe Facility, Cultural Programme Facility, EU-European Bank for Reconstruction and Development and World Bank partnerships, Northern Dimension Environmental Partnership Support fund, etc.).<sup>12</sup>

On the other hand, there are also negative transference instruments which consist mainly of economic sanctions, including embargoes, anti-dumping measures in trade policy and indirect transferences, such as externalities derived from the adoption of EU technical regulations and standards (difficult access to third markets and the negative impacts of fast liberalisation on emerging industries). In the case of the ENP, the EU mainly used these instruments in a positive manner, e.g. lifting restrictions concerning trade of specific goods with some neighbouring countries,<sup>13</sup> although sanctions have also been in use.<sup>14</sup>

*Declaratory instruments* of the European foreign policy encompass a great number of standard diplomatic means for communicating EU positions including declarations, confidential demarches, non-papers and public statements. Similarly, political documents such as the Conclusions of Council Presidency as well as Communications from the Commission present “overviews of the rationale of the Union’s relationship with the world outside” (Whitman 1997, 67) and have a declaratory and informational nature. The content of declaratory instruments of the European foreign policy varies in terms of its specificity, topic, purpose and outreach. Their main functions nevertheless are twofold: to inform other actors about the EU’s positions and to integrate the views of different EU actors. In the case of the ENP, all these instruments have been employed. The most comprehensive instrument of this nature are Communications, Country and Progress Reports presented by the European Commission that scrutinise the implementation of the ENP Action Plans and AAs, as well as provide information on further priorities, expectations and recommendations as refers the implementation of the ENP.

Finally, the *overt instruments* refer to the permanent or transitory physical presence of the EU and its representatives outside the community. In the case of permanent physical presence of EU representatives, the European Commission has more than 130 delegations all over the world (representing the EU, after the Lisbon Treaty entering into force); there are Special Representatives of the EU in different regions of the world, particularly in areas of conflict or instability. Additionally, there are short-term EU missions such as missions of electoral observation and European Security and Defence Policy military and civilian missions have also been present in a number of countries, including ENP countries, becoming one of the most important instruments in the field of conflict management. The transitory presence of EU representatives includes official high-level visits of EU representatives or personal visits of the EU High Representative for the CFSP, Commissioners or members of the European Parliament.

*Existing and emergent social structures as practices*

Conceptually, structures can be defined as patterned behaviours woven into social orders guided by the principles (rules, norms and regulations) that organise relations between actors engaged in interactions within a particular social domain.<sup>15</sup> In order to better comprehend the diversity of structures, a taxonomy of order (structure) vis-à-vis its units is essential for the discussion here.

*Defining structures as practices*

In IR literature there are broadly two theoretical conceptions for understanding social structures – one premised on the principles of anarchy and/or cooperation; and the other on the principles of ordered hierarchies and subordination. The former approach is frequently associated with neorealism that imagines international structures as being organised around the principles of anarchy, functional differentiation and distribution of capabilities presupposing the lack of stable hierarchies similar to domestic politics (Waltz 1979). Other scholars, however, propose to view international structures as emerging from the relations of cooperation driven by benefits' maximisation, but premised on the strategy of reciprocity (specific and diffused) and material or functional – the multifaceted components of partnership-building in IR (Keohane 1986; Abrahamsen 2004; Korosteleva 2012).

Social structures can also be analysed from the perspective of international hierarchies as inherent features of international order (Clark 1989, 2009). The latter presuppose a relational inequality of resources, capabilities and authority, and often feature in the discussions power arrangements including rule transference, in the hierarchical order.

Thus, there seems to be an intrinsic antagonism between the two conceptual takings on social structures – those premised on international anarchy and those of international hierarchies (Lake 1996), distinguished by the presence of political authority that mediate among the states: "A political relationship is anarchic if the units – in this case, states – possess no authority over one another. It is hierarchic when one unit, the dominant state, possesses authority over a second, subordinate state" (Lake 2007, 50). The relationship of hierarchy inevitably introduces the issue of states' organisation around a certain centre and their polarity in hierarchical structures (Donnelly 2006). The centralisation and polarity of structures might be affected by the degree of participation and the character of units engaged in this structure, thus engendering complexities of structure and incurring differentiation (Donnelly 2009; Albert and Buzan 2010). In a nutshell, the dichotomy between anarchy and hierarchy in international social structures exemplifies the tension between the relations of equality and inequality, of domination and subordination of arranging units into organised structures, centre and periphery, and the nature of ownership.

Traditionally the units of structure in international orders have been associated with states as the principal actors. The nature and functions of principal actors of the international order have evolved considerably, thus bringing plurality and complexity of interactions into the existing and emergent social structures. However, this plurality of actors may lead to the perception of a "disaggregated world order", where traditional hierarchies have been progressively substituted by networks as new forms of order connecting individuals and groups of society (Castells 1996; Slaughter 2004). In this regard, the problem of inclusiveness and exclusiveness can provide additional insight into the dynamics of the evolution of social structures. In the context of the ENP/EaP, this evolution is particularly noteworthy depicting a shift away from state actors as the main agents of interaction towards new and multifaceted non-governmental agents including the CSF (European Commission 2009), the EURONEST parliamentary assembly (Constituent Act of the EURONEST Parliamentary Assembly 2011), the CORLEAP (Annual Conference of Regional and Local Authorities for the Eastern Partnership 2011), and the Sopot Business

Forum.<sup>16</sup> This extension of social practices to reach “all levels of society” could trigger the emergence of new structured domains which challenge the established centre/periphery, hierarchy/network, exclusive/inclusive modes of governance, and necessitate the redistribution of power in a less regimented way (Merlingen 2011). In addition to these new initiatives, more traditional and long-standing structures continue to provide basis for more conventional practices with ensuing networked relations and structures (Black Sea Economic Cooperation (BSEC) and Black Sea Scientific Network), extending domains for sectoral and regional cooperation (INOGATE, TRACECA and Baku initiative).<sup>17</sup>

### *Integrative perspective on actors and structures*

It is our claim in this special issue that different hierarchical structures of international order, inclusive of plurality and complexity of non-state actors with the right to participate in these structures could be usefully treated through the *practices perspective*. Practices may be necessitated by policy instruments, but receive their meaning and material realisation through patterned behaviours of competent individuals acting towards the collective goal. The attribution of competence to these non-state actors by the EU policy instruments provides the ground for their inclusion as meaningful actors in the development and consolidation of shared practices in the context of EU-neighbours’ relations.

It is however worth remembering that neither structures nor actors participating in international practices are assumed to be self-subsistent subjects. Their purpose and action could only be deductively grasped through the examination of two mutually constitutive elements: actors performing practices and structures reflecting those performances. As mentioned earlier individual practices can create their own structures; but when interconnected they can be ordered into different types of relations. Adler and Pouliot (2011, 20) distinguished four main types of relationship among particular sets of practices: parallel existence of practices linked in space and/or time, but not interfering significantly; symbiosis where practices are distinct, but they form a coherent whole; hybridisation combining and forming new types of practices; and subordination when practices form part of a hierarchical relationship. Therefore, bearing in mind the complexity of action, both policy instruments and emergent structures organised within and around competent collective actions, become essential referents in this inquiry.

Policy instruments reveal types of social relations between the governing and the governed, social control and ways of exercising it (Lascoumes and Le Galès 2007). From a sociological point of view, policy instruments emphasise institutional aspects of producing structures of opportunities and institutional frames within which social interactions take place. That is why, from the practices perspective, they could be seen as closely associated and even overlapping with social structures, whereby they become both the cause and the effect of social interactions, by creating their own ordered subjectivities (e.g. CSF could be interpreted as a policy instrument and the emergent social structure). Features of policy instruments hold specific logics of social structures and their employment can change existing assumptions concerning social structures, privileging some actors to the detriment of other actors (Schneider and Ingram 1993) and vice versa, existing social structures can affect the selection of policy instruments (Bressers and O’Toole 1998). The employment of policy instruments encompasses assumptions about the relations of equality and inequality, exclusivity and inclusivity, as well as hierarchy and network. Much of the analysis of the policy instrument in the realm of public policy assumes strict hierarchical relations between the government employing policy instruments and the governed who are both the recipients and agents of the new social structures (Hood 1983; Hood and Margetts 2007).

The plurality of agents and agencies, operating through different power centres, policy instruments and social structures, force governments to balance and remain agile in an attempt to sustain existing or emergent order. Given this systemic fluidity, it is essential to study how interactions work (especially when challenging hierarchies), how policy instruments shape actors' behaviour, and whether they allow for the re-distribution of ownership and access to resources (material incentives, information and knowledge) to foster new structures and forge different power relations.

### Issue structure

The conceptual *perspective of practices* on the implementation of the ENP in the eastern region, which links policy instruments and social structures into a continuous process of interaction between multilevel agencies and agents, aims to offer a more holistic and coherent overview of the policy's success and limitations. Aligned with the conceptual framework, the contributions assembled in this issue examine various practices surrounding discourses, actions and meanings of the instruments and structures, to understand whether the former adequately respond to the needs of partner countries, and whether the emergent patterned behaviours triggered by these instruments, support the production of sustainable social structures.

The overall objective is to establish how, through the assemblage of instruments, actions and behaviours, the existing and emergent social structures, with their self-subsistent order of units and relations of power, become established and legitimated. The authors' inquiry, geographical and/or thematic, is arranged around the following key questions to enable cross-comparative study of the ENP's eastern dimension from the practices-instruments-structures perspective:

- Which *policy instruments* deployed in a given case study are more effective in attaining stated objectives than the others, and why? What relationships of governance do they gestate? Do they allow for "local ownership", and is the responsibility reciprocal? How inclusive are these practices of participation (especially of decision-making) that are organised around the ENP/EaP instruments?
- What *patterned behaviours* have emerged, and whether they challenge the existing social order? Which modes of behaviour are more successful than others, and why? Are there new structures accessible, reciprocal, and inclusive? How is power distributed within the new structures: are local units less dependent on the centre in their actions? Are the existing and emergent social structures balanced or hierarchical? Do they offer maximum benefits to all parties concerned? Are the new power configurations centripetal, durable and locally owned? Are the practices perceived to be of reciprocity and equivalence?

These and other more specific issues are addressed by the contributions to this special issue, in an attempt to overcome the schism in various analytical perspectives on explicating the ENP/EaP's practices, and also to understand the causes for the policies' dwindling credibility in the eastern region.

After this conceptual introduction of setting up the analytical framework of the issue, the next contribution by Licinia Simão examines the case of the EU regional cooperation in the South Caucasus. The paper offers a useful discussion of the EU policy instruments and regional strategies aiming to consolidate a shared community of practices between the EU and the South Caucasus, building on the juxtaposition of constructivist and rationalist perspectives. Breaking down these relations to sub-regional actions and meanings, and studying their effect on developing stable networked interactions between multiple actors, the paper raises a discussion of adequacy of the

EU means to the local discourses and requirements. The author believes that transferring policy instruments into specific reciprocity (of material benefits) and broadening the format for regional cooperation around the South Caucasus accounting for variable geometry will instigate the emergence of more stable patterns of behaviour, driven by local and regional knowledge exchange and shared competent practices.

This is followed by Natalia Timuş's paper which explores the case of EU democracy promotion in the eastern neighbourhood, especially in instigating electoral reforms to achieve better institutional convergence with the EU and international legal systems. The paper discusses various policy instruments at the disposal of the EU and other co-opted international organisations (Council of Europe and Organisation for Security and Co-operation in Europe), and the practices surrounding their inculcation into the neighbourhood. In particular, this study illustrates that the EU policy has to be situated in a broader international institutional context, which specifies and determines the exact scope of expected reforms. It is contended that in order for more stable and effective structures to emerge they need to be locally owned, allowing for some degree of freedom and adaptability to the "European legal menu". At the same time, further Europeanisation of institutional practices that surround policy instruments, and their inter-institutional synchronicity and coherence would ensure more effectiveness and accountability.

In the subsequent paper Mukhtar Hajizada and Florent Marciacq unpack the constellation of regional practices which surround the Black Sea Synergy initiative, and have engendered the development of a new structure – the Wider Black Sea Area (WBSA). In particular, the scholars investigate the workings and effectiveness of the BSEC as one of the regional initiatives to facilitate the development of the WBSA. By deconstructing the patterns of regional trade in this area, fostered by the broader format of EU cooperation (including bilateral links) and sub-regional actions, the scholars suggest that the emergent practices pertinent to these activities should be viewed in conjunction as "mutually reinforcing" rather than as independent and concurrent undertakings in their own right. This is particularly relevant as the BSEC struggles to translate into a stable structure of intraregional trading. Hence, only through the area's gradual inclusion in the continental-scale scheme of EU-facilitated economic regionalism, security and stability alongside more specific objectives of economic and environmental governance under the Black Sea Synergy could be achieved.

Viktoriya Khasson in her paper focuses on the effectiveness of the EU-eastern neighbours' CBC under the ENPI. In particular, the contribution examines the impact of regional actors in fostering sustainable practices of interaction and reproduction of effective patterns of behaviour. The paper contends that the CBC instrument, despite its potential, currently does not appear to be conducive to generating shared policy spaces of network governance, owing to the overly complicated rules of engagement and tender procedures. The practices surrounding this policy instrument remain one-sided receiving limited legitimacy on the ground, by the involved partners. Greater regional mobilisation across the eastern neighbourhood, rendering more responsibility, more specific reciprocity associated with tangible benefits and access for the local actors, is necessary to make this cooperation functional.

Laure Delcour offers an insightful analysis of the EU engagement in the convergence practices in Georgia. In particular, the paper insists on the importance of reversing the Europeanisation perspective onto the partner countries themselves taking their standpoint into account, as the social practices are invariably mediated by partners' preferences, interests, norms and discourses. The paper offers a holistic analytical framework which examines the practices of convergence around the three sets of variables – of EU-level factors that instigate convergence; domestic-level; and regional/international level factors that may facilitate or resist convergence. For empirical investigation the article has selected the practices of visa liberalisation and food safety, as highly contested and complex domains of policy convergence. In a close study of official documents and implementation narratives, the article contends that domestic factors appear to be most

instrumental for ensuring the emergence of stable patterns of behaviour, and sustainable structures of cooperation. This is further reinforced by the regional forces at play, which often serve as motivational triggers for further domestic restructuring.

Michal Natorski concludes this issue by offering a detailed overview of the Ukraine's cognitive judicial social structures that mediate the ENP's realisation and act as an interface between the EU policy instruments and EU respective expectations, and the Ukrainian domestic arenas which adopt the intended practices. The paper argues that the success and failure of the implementation of the ENP Action Plan (and subsequent negotiation of the AA and annual agendas) effectively rests with Ukraine's understanding of EU discourses. These cognitive structures that emerge in response to policy instruments invariably shape the way in which policy reforms are promoted and subsequently assimilated by third parties. It is precisely the degree of convergence between the EU's policy discourses and the recipient's understanding of their meanings and levels of engagement, that forms the focus of his examination. In particular the essay centres on the examination of EU mechanisms of legal convergence and technical assistance to Ukraine, aimed at promoting reforms of the judiciary system, pointing to rather mixed outcomes that emerged as a consequence of adopted practices. It concludes that more adaptive forms of policy practices attuned to the capacities on the ground, and more transparently administered, are necessary in order to ensure actors' mobilisation and convergence. Furthermore, a more inclusive design of practices, appealing to "all strands of society" (European Commission 2011, 2) rather working through exclusive hierarchies of government, is essential for the production of sustainable patterns of cooperation.

### **Tentative conclusions**

Overall, the issue offers an in-depth discussion of the ENP's practices in the eastern region, cutting across various policy instruments and emergent social structures, to foster more coherent understanding of discrepancies which currently permeate everyday interactions between the EU and partner countries thus limiting policy's effectiveness and credibility. A broader focus on practices as "socially meaningful patterns of action" (Adler and Pouliot 2011, 4) also allows to ponder more consistently about the emergent configurations of power encompassing the issues of resources, ownership, access and sustainability.

The issue concedes that although the proliferation and adaptation of EU instruments and the explication of agents' behaviour in relation to the new challenges of the external environment are critical for ensuring credibility and effectiveness of the EU action, this in itself is not sufficient. The instruments and multiplicity of agents (especially at the local and intermediary levels), in their evolving complexity, should be inextricably linked to the emergent and existent structures, to understand the cause and the effect of the action. This is the main conceptual tenet of this issue: the focus on practices allows for clearer transparency and better causal understanding of actions and their meanings, and whether they necessarily reach the transformative moment of binding performative and interpretative practices into a continuum of shared meanings and generalised standards of behaviour (Navari 2011).

The empirical focus on the individual case studies reinforces the relevance and utility of the conceptual framework of practices, by verifying through individualised localities of instruments – regionally, thematically, sectorally or issue-based – the degree of effectiveness of the EU action in the neighbourhood. In order for emergent structures to accommodate shared meanings and develop them into patterned behaviours in the production of the new and desired social order, more collective (reciprocal) learning is necessary; and from a scholarly perspective, a more integrative analytical effort is required to offer a fungible perspective on the EU's external actions.

## Acknowledgements

The authors wish to thank the University Association for Contemporary European Studies Collaborative Research Network “EU-Russia” under whose auspices this issue has been conceptually conceived, as well as the journal editors and anonymous referees for their helpful guidance and feedback. We are also indebted to the Economic and Social Research Council (RES-061-25-0001) for the financial support of research which contributed to this issue.

## Notes

1. The latter include Integrated Border Management; small- and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) Facility; Regional Electricity Markets, Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy Sources; Prevention, Preparedness and Response to natural and man-made Disasters (PPRD); and finally Environmental Governance. For more information, see [http://eeas.europa.eu/eastern/docs/2011\\_eap\\_flagships\\_initiatives\\_en.pdf](http://eeas.europa.eu/eastern/docs/2011_eap_flagships_initiatives_en.pdf), accessed March 2012.
2. This definition builds upon the conceptualisation of practices in social theory that linked several elements, interconnected to one another: forms of bodily activities, forms of mental activities, “things” and their use, a background knowledge in the form of understanding and know-how, states of emotion and motivational knowledge (see Reckwitz 2002).
3. Specifically, background knowledge is tacit, inarticulate, implicit, contextual, automatic since learnt experimentally “in and through practice, and remains bound up in it” (Reckwitz 2002, 270).
4. The practices turn in IR is inspired in particular by Pierre Bourdieu’s sociology (Bourdieu 1977, 1990; also see Pouliot 2008; Leander 2010, 2011; Bigo 2011).
5. See more discussion in the following section on structures.
6. In addition, both authors differentiate analytically between instruments and capabilities, where capabilities are “resources that are made operational but which are not yet translated into the specific instruments which may be applied in practical politics” (Brighi and Hill 2008, 130–131).
7. EU sanctions may include diplomatic measures limiting the intensity and status of political relations as well as a limitation on economic relations through the imposition of embargoes.
8. The ENP and EaP do not have direct treaty provisions, and on this basis is seen as a soft law policy.
9. For more information, see [http://www.enpi-info.eu/main.php?id\\_type=2&id=359](http://www.enpi-info.eu/main.php?id_type=2&id=359). In addition, there are also thematic financial instruments, including the Instrument for Stability, the European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights, etc.
10. For more information, see [http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/where/neighbourhood/regional-cooperation/irc/investment\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/where/neighbourhood/regional-cooperation/irc/investment_en.htm).
11. A full list of regional projects can be found on [http://www.enpi-info.eu/list\\_projects\\_east.php?lang\\_id=450](http://www.enpi-info.eu/list_projects_east.php?lang_id=450).
12. For more information, see [http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/where/neighbourhood/regional-cooperation/enpi-east/annual-programmes\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/where/neighbourhood/regional-cooperation/enpi-east/annual-programmes_en.htm).
13. However, the EU maintains targeted sanctions directed towards some individuals in countries (Belarus) or territories (Transnistria) and has used anti-dumping measures concerning some products.
14. The EU has applied some limited political (visa restriction, asset freeze and recall of EU ambassadors) and economic sanctions (Generalised Scheme of Preferences withdrawal) to stimulate Belarus’ regime for more constructive engagement. For more information, see [http://eeas.europa.eu/belarus/index\\_en.htm](http://eeas.europa.eu/belarus/index_en.htm).
15. Social structures are “the most basic, enduring, and determinative patterns in social life” (Calhoun 2002). Social structure refers to durable features of sustained, large-scale, social coexistence that shape the individual conduct and typically address the five facets of human society: “(1) collective features, process, or patterns that are (2) consistent across large populations and (3) persist for long periods and that are (4) manifest as impersonal and implacable influences that strongly condition (5) the lives that individuals can lead”.
16. For more information, see <http://www.easternpartnership.org/community/events/eastern-partnership-business-forum-sopot>.
17. For more information, see [http://eeas.europa.eu/blacksea/index\\_en.htm](http://eeas.europa.eu/blacksea/index_en.htm).

## Notes on contributors

Elena A. Korosteleva is Professor of International Politics, School of Politics and IR, and Director (Professional Studies) of the Global Europe Centre, University of Kent. She is the author and editor of a number of books

and special issues, with the focus on democratisation and EU foreign policies. Her recent work, *The EU and its Eastern Neighbours: Towards a More Ambitious Partnership?* (Routledge, 2012) is a result of her large ESRC-funded project “Europeanising or Securitising the Outsiders? Assessing the EU’s Partnership-building Approach with Eastern Europe” (RES-061-25-0001).

Michal Natolski is a Senior Research Fellow at the European Neighbourhood Policy Chair, College of Europe (Natolin Campus). He was an Associate Lecturer in International Relations at the Autonomous University of Barcelona as well as Visiting Scholar at the London School of Economics, Aberystwyth University, Peace Research Institute Frankfurt, and Free University of Berlin. His co-authored articles have appeared in the *Journal of European Public Policy*, *Cooperation and Conflict*, *Journal of Contemporary European Research*, *European Political Economy Review*, and the *Journal of Constitutional Law in Eastern and Central Europe*. He has also authored numerous chapters about different aspects of the EU foreign policy.

Licinia Simão is Assistant Professor in International Relations at the University of Coimbra and Researcher at the Centre for Social Studies at the same university. Her research interests include EU foreign policy, European security and the former-Soviet space, particularly the South Caucasus and Central Asia. She has published articles in several leading journals including *International Politics*, *Communist and Post-communist Studies* and *Journal of Contemporary European Studies*, among others, as well as several chapters in edited books, such as *Russia, the European Union, and the Areas in Between* (Republic of Letters 2012), *Russia and Its Near Neighbors: Identity, Interests and Foreign Policy* (Palgrave 2012), and *The European Union, Civil Society and Conflict* (Routledge 2011).

## References

- Abrahamsen, R. 2004. “The Power of Partnerships in Global Governance.” *Third World Quarterly* 25 (8): 1453–1467.
- Adler, E. 2008. “The Spread of Security Communities: Communities of Practice, Self-Restraint, and NATO’s Post-Cold War Transformation.” *European Journal of International Relations* 14 (2): 195–230.
- Adler, E., and V. Pouliot. 2011. “International Practices: Introduction and Framework.” In *International Practices*, edited by E. Adler and V. Pouliot, 3–35. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Albert, M., and B. Buzan. 2010. “Differentiation Theory: A Sociological Approach to International Relations Theory.” *European Journal of International Relations* 16 (3): 315–337.
- Annual Conference of Regional and Local Authorities for the Eastern Partnership. Founding document 143/2011 item 7, Brussels, April 29. <http://cor.europa.eu/en/activities/Pages/corleap.aspx>
- Balzacq, T. 2008. “The Policy Tools of Securitization: Information Exchange: EU Foreign and Interior Policies.” *Journal of Common Market Studies* 46 (1): 75–100.
- Barnes, B. 2001. “Practice as Collective Action.” In *The Practice Turn on Contemporary Theory*, edited by T. Schatzki, K. Knorr Cetina and E. von Savigny, 17–28. New York: Routledge.
- Bechev, D., and K. Nicolaidis. 2010. “From Policy to Polity: Can the EU’s Special Relations with Its ‘Neighbourhood’ Be Decentred?” *Journal of Common Market Studies* 48 (3): 475–500.
- Bigo, D. 2011. “Pierre Bourdieu and International Relations: Power of Practices, Practice of Power.” *International Political Sociology* 5 (3): 225–258.
- Bourdieu, P. 1977. *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. 1990. *The Logic of Practice*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Bressers, H., and L. O’Toole. 1998. “The Selection of Policy Instruments: A Network-Based Perspective.” *Journal of Public Policy* 18 (3): 213–239.
- Brighi, E., and C. Hill. 2008. “Implementation and Behaviour.” In *Foreign Policy. Theories, Actors and Cases*, edited by S. Smith, A. Hadfield and T. Dunne, 117–135. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Calhoun, C. 2002. “Social Structure.” In *Dictionary of the Social Sciences*, edited by C. Calhoun. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Oxford Reference Online. Accessed March 22, 2012. <http://www.oxfordreference.com/views/ENTRY.html?subview=Main&entry=t104.e1563>
- Castells, M. 1996. *The Rise of the Network Society*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Clark, I. 1989. *The Hierarchy of States: Reform and Resistance in the International Order*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Clark, I. 2009. “How Hierarchical Can International Society Be?” *International Relations* 23 (3): 464–480.
- Commission of the European Communities. 2008. *Eastern Partnership*. Communication to the European Parliament and the Council, Brussels, COM (2008) 823 final.



- Constituent Act of the EURONEST Parliamentary Assembly. 2011. *Official Journal of the European Union*. (July) (2011/C 198/06). Accessed March 10, 2012. <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:C:2011:198:0004:0006:EN:PDF>
- Council of the European Union. 2009. *Joint Declaration of the Prague Eastern Partnership Summit*. Brussels, 8435/09 (Presse 78).
- Donnelly, J. 2006. "Sovereign Inequalities and Hierarchy in Anarchy: American Power and International Society." *European Journal of International Relations* 12 (2): 139–170.
- Donnelly, J. 2009. "Rethinking Political Structures: From 'Ordering Principles' to 'Vertical Differentiation' – and Beyond." *International Theory* 1 (1): 49–86.
- European Commission. 2009. *Eastern Partnership Civil Society Forum Concept Paper*. Accessed March 10, 2012. [http://eeas.europa.eu/eastern/civil\\_society/docs/concept\\_en.pdf](http://eeas.europa.eu/eastern/civil_society/docs/concept_en.pdf)
- European Commission. 2010. *Taking Stock of the European Neighbourhood Policy*. Communication to the European Parliament and the Council, Brussels, COM (2010) 207.
- European Commission. 2011. *A New Response to a Changing Neighbourhood*. Joint Communication to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of Regions, Brussels, COM (2011) 303.
- EuropeAid Development and Cooperation DG. 2011. Update on Eastern Partnership Implementation, EaP Summit, Warsaw, September 29–30. Accessed March 7, 2012. [http://eeas.europa.eu/eastern/docs/eap\\_vademecum\\_14122009\\_en.pdf](http://eeas.europa.eu/eastern/docs/eap_vademecum_14122009_en.pdf)
- EEAS (European External Action Service). 2010. *Vademecum on Financing in the Frame of the Eastern Partnership*. Accessed March 6, 2012. [http://eeas.europa.eu/eastern/docs/eap\\_vademecum\\_14122009\\_en.pdf](http://eeas.europa.eu/eastern/docs/eap_vademecum_14122009_en.pdf)
- Foucault, M. 2009. *Security, Territory, Population. Lectures at the Collège de France 1977–1978*. Edited by M. Senellart. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Füle, S. 2012. "Strong Support for Eastern Partnership." Prague meeting, March 6. Accessed March 5, 2012. [http://ec.europa.eu/commission\\_2010-2014/fule/headlines/news/2012/03/20120305\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/commission_2010-2014/fule/headlines/news/2012/03/20120305_en.htm)
- Gänzle, S. 2009. "EU Governance and the European Neighbourhood Policy: A Framework for Analysis." *Europe-Asia Studies* 61 (10): 1715–1734.
- Hansen, L. 2011. "Performing Practices: A Poststructuralist Analysis of the Muhammad Cartoon Crisis." In *International Practices*, edited by E. Adler and V. Pouliot, 280–309. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hood, C. 1983. *The Tools of Government*. London: Macmillan.
- Hood, C., and H. Margetts. 2007. *The Tools of Government in the Digital Age*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Joseph, J. 2010. "The Limits of Governmentality: Social Theory and the International." *European Journal of International Relations* 16 (2): 223–246.
- Keohane, R. 1986. "Reciprocity in International Relations." *International Organization* 40 (1): 1–27.
- Korosteleva, E., ed. 2011. *Eastern Partnership: A New Opportunity for the Neighbours?* London: Routledge.
- Korosteleva, E. 2012. *The European Union and Its Eastern Neighbours: Towards a More Ambitious Partnership?* London: Routledge.
- Kurki, M. 2011. "Governmentality and EU Democracy Promotion: The European Instrument for Democracy and Human Rights and the Construction of Democratic Civil Societies." *International Political Sociology* 5 (4): 349–366.
- Lake, D. 1996. "Anarchy, Hierarchy and the Variety of International Relations." *International Organization* 50 (1): 1–33.
- Lake, D. 2007. "Escape from the State of Nature. Authority and Hierarchy in World Politics." *International Security* 32 (1): 47–79.
- Lascoumes, P., and P. Le Galès. 2007. "Introduction: Understanding Public Policy Through Its Instruments – From the Nature of Instruments to the Sociology of Public Policy Instrumentation." *Governance: An International Journal of Policy, Administration, and Institutions* 20 (1): 1–21.
- Lavenex, S. 2009. "A Governance Perspective on the European Neighbourhood Policy: Integration Beyond Conditionality?" *Journal of European Public Policy* 15 (6): 938–955.
- Leander, A. 2010. "Habitue and Field." In *International Studies Compendium Project*, edited by R. Denmark, 3255–3270. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Leander, A. 2011. "The Promises, Problems and Potentials of a Bourdieue-Inspired Staging of International Relations." *International Political Sociology* 5 (3): 294–313.
- Merlingen, M. 2011. "From Governance to Governmentality in CSDP: Towards a Foucauldian Research Agenda." *Journal of Common Market Studies* 49 (1): 149–169.

- Navari, C. 2011. "The Concept of Practice in the English School." *European Journal of International Relations* 17 (6): 611–630.
- Neumann, I. 2002. "Returning Practice to the Linguistic Turn: The Case of Diplomacy." *Millennium* 31 (3): 627–651.
- Neumann, I., and V. Pouliot. 2011. "Untimely Russia: Hysteresis in Russian-Western Relations over the Past Millennium." *Security Studies* 20 (1): 105–137.
- Polish-Swedish Initiative. 2008. *Eastern Partnership*. May 23. Accessed March 6, 2012. <http://www.ms.gov.pl/Polish-Swedish,Proposal,19911.html>
- Pouliot, V. 2008. "The Logic of Practicality: A Theory of Practice of Security Communities." *International Organization* 62 (2): 257–288.
- Reckwitz, A. 2002. "Toward a Theory of Social Practices: A Development in Culturalist Theorizing." *European Journal of Social Theory* 5 (2): 243–263.
- Schatzki, T. R., K. Cetina, and E. von Savigny, eds. 2001. *The Practice Turn on Contemporary Theory*. New York: Routledge.
- Schneider, A., and H. Ingram. 1993. "Social Construction of Target Populations: Implications for Politics and Policy." *American Political Science Review* 87 (2): 334–347.
- Slaughter, A.-M. 2004. *A New World Order*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Smith, K. 2003. *European Union Foreign Policy in a Changing World*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Smith, M. E. 2005. "Implementation: Making the EU's International Relations Work." In *International Relations and the European Union*, edited by C. Hill and M. Smith, 154–176. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Stetter, S. 2004. "Cross-Pillar Politics: Functional Unity and Institutional Fragmentation of EU Foreign Policies." *Journal of Common Market Studies* 11 (4): 720–739.
- Stetter, S. 2007. *EU Foreign and Interior Policies, Cross-Pillar Politics and the Social Construction of Sovereignty*. London: Routledge.
- Swidler, A. 2001. "What Anchors Cultural Practices?" In *The Practice Turn on Contemporary Theory*, edited by T. Schatzki, K. Knorr Cetina and E. von Savigny, 74–92. New York: Routledge.
- Waltz, K. 1979. *Theory of International Politics*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Whitman, R. 1997. "The International Identity of the European Union: Instruments as Identity." In *Rethinking the European Union. Institutions, Interests and Identities*, edited by A. Landau and R. Whitman, 54–71. Basingstoke: Macmillan Press.
- Whitman, R., and S. Wolff, eds. 2010. *The European Neighbourhood Policy in Perspective*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.