

European Research Reloaded: Cooperation and Integration among Europeanized States

Ronald Holzacker and Markus Haverland

**Directors - European Research Colloquium of the
Netherlands Institute of Government**

Final Draft of the introductory chapter (July 9, 2004)

Table of Contents:

**European Research Reloaded:
Cooperation and Integration
among Europeanized States**

0. Introduction: Cooperation and integration among Europeanized States- Markus Haverland and Ronald Holzacker

Europeanization of the Member States - beyond goodness of fit:

1. Beyond Goodness of Fit: A preference-based account of Europeanization- Ellen Mastebroek (Leiden University) and Mendeltje van Keulen (University of Twente and Netherlands Institute of International Relations -Clingendael)
2. Framing European Integration in Germany and Italy: Is the EU used to justify pension reforms?- Sabina Stiller (University of Nijmegen)
3. Making use of the EU:: The Europeanization of Regulatory Policy in Denmark- Morten Kallestrup (Aalborg University)
4. Aggregating, mobilizing and recruiting: EU integration and party function change – Harmen Binnema (Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam)

European Integration - Integration and cooperation among Europeanized states:

5. The Europeanization of Central Decision Makers Preferences concerning Europe: A Perpetual Motion?- Femke van Esch (University of Nijmegen)
6. Domesticated wolves? Length of membership and states' integration preferences at the Convention on the Future of Europe - Dirk Leuffen (University of Mannheim) and Sander Luitwieler (Erasmus University Rotterdam)
7. Beyond the Community Method: Why the Open Method of Coordination was introduced to EU policy-making - Armin Schäfer (Max Plank Institute for the Study of Societies Cologne)

Conceptual Challenges - Territory, governance and changing notions of sovereignty:

8. European Integration and Unfreezing Territoriality: The Case of the European Health Card– Hans Vollaard (Leiden University)

9. The Externalization of European Governance: Migration and the EU Politics of Inclusion/Exclusion - Rens van Munster (University of Southern Denmark) and Steven Sterkx (University of Antwerp)

10. Sovereignty Reloaded? A constructivist Perspective on European Research - Tanja Aalberts (Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam)

Abstract

This book argues that a third wave of research on the EU is needed to adequately understand the increased interconnectedness between the European and national political levels. We posit that this third wave should be sensitive to the temporal dimension of European integration and Europeanization. In particular, we seek to link the processes of Europeanization and European integration in a new way by asking the question: how has Europeanization affected current modes of integration and cooperation in the EU?

Preparing the ground for the third wave, the first part of the book concerns Europeanization. In order to fully understand the feedback of Europeanization on cooperation and integration it is important to analyze how European integration has had an impact on member states in the first place, in particular indirectly, beyond the direct mechanism of compliance with European policies. The research presented here stresses the role which domestic actors and in particular governments have in guiding the Europeanization impact on the member states.

The second part of the book concerns integration and cooperation, in line with what we see as a third wave of research. Here we analyze how prior integration effects, that is Europeanization, influences current preferences for integration. We find that earlier integration effects have had a significant influence on those preferences, resulting however, somewhat surprisingly not always for a preference for closer integration.

The multi-faceted interrelationships between the EU level and the national level and the increased interconnectedness between them cast doubt on the appropriateness of traditional readings of central concepts of political science and international relations such as territory, identity and sovereignty. The final section of the book therefore concerns the conceptual challenges faced by the continued development of multi-level governance. These contributions show that a conceptual reorientation is necessary because up until now these concepts have been almost exclusively linked to the nation state.

One of the key findings of the book is the astonishing variation in modes of cooperation and integration in the EU. We suggest that this variation can be explained by taking into account the sources of legitimacy at the national and at the EU level on which cooperation and integration are based. We argue that whereas economic integration, in particular the creation of a single market, could be sufficiently backed by output legitimacy, deeper integration in other areas requires a degree of input legitimacy that is currently lacking in the EU. Therefore, non-economic integration is often taking the form of looser types of cooperation, such as the open method of coordination and benchmarking, allowing domestic actors more control over the Europeanization of these policies onto the member state. We elaborate on this speculation in the conclusion and believe that it should be part of the future research agenda of the third wave of European research.

This book emerged from the European Research Colloquium of the Netherlands Institute of Government, in which a small group of researchers from the Netherlands, Germany, Belgium, and Denmark met every 6 months over the past three years to debate substantive topics, the choice of research design and methodology, and, in particular, the empirical research presented by each author in this book.

0. Introduction

European integration has come along way since early visionaries such as Jean Monet set forth the basic idea of Europe in the post-war period. While the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC, 1951), the European Atomic Energy Community (Euratom, 1957), and the European Economic Community (EEC, 1957) were all quite limited both in the scope of supranational decision-making and their subsequent impact on the member states, the European Union after the Single European Act (1986) and the treaties of Maastricht (1993), Amsterdam (1999), and Nice (2000) established the basis for intensive intergovernmental and supranational decision making in a whole range of policy areas. This evolving process of European integration has had a deep, although varied, impact on the member states.

But the process of integration and Europeanization has not continued uniformly over the past decades. There appears to have been a dramatic change in the relationship between the EU and its member states in the late 1980's and early 1990's. This is a time which corresponds to the fundamental completion of the Single Market and the dramatic developments in Central and Eastern Europe.

„The decade from 1985 to 1995 was a watershed in the political development of the EU, for it introduced more intense public scrutiny of European decision-making, more extensive interest group mobilization, and less insulated elite decision-making. The period beginning with the Single European Act and culminating with the decision to establish economic and monetary union created the conditions for politicized-participatory decision making in the EU by increasing the stakes of political conflict, broadening the scope of authoritative decision making, opening new avenues of group influence, and creating incentives for a quantum increase in political mobilization.“ (Hooghe and Marks, 2001: 126).

This political development has intensified the interconnectedness between the EU and the national level, a phenomenon now widely referred to as multi-level governance (Hooghe and Marks 2001, Kohler-Koch 2003, Scharpf 1999), that has raised – among other things - new concerns concerning the democratic legitimacy of the European project. It is our conviction that the intensified interaction necessitates bringing the two major strands of

research on the European Union together, both the European integration (bottom-up) and the Europeanization of the member states (top-down) perspectives. There have been considerable efforts to explain these processes individually. This book seeks to begin to consider how these two processes can be seen as systematically related processes theoretically and explored through empirical research. The idea is to begin to have a greater appreciation for the development of multi-level governance over time, as a kind of cork-screw rotating continuously with top-down and bottom-up processes of interaction between levels of governance.

We see this book as being at the turning point towards a new third wave of research on the EU. The first wave concerned European integration, the process of institution building and policy developments at the EU level. Most of the early thinking in this area was done from an international relations perspective, discussing the interaction of the member states. Later thinking on integration concentrated further on the development of the EU institutions themselves, and involved a wide range of perspectives from institutional thinkers, legal scholars, economists, and policy analysts (Haas 1957, Lindberg and Scheingold 1971, Moravscik 1999, Stone Sweet and Sandholtz 1998).

The second wave of research, on Europeanization of the member states, has gained prominence a decade ago and has since exploded with great vigor. This research direction uses EU integration as an explanatory factor in understanding domestic political change and continuity. Here the comparativists came to the fore and sought to compare the impact which the EU and European integration has on the domestic politics of the member states (Cowles, Risse, and Carporaso 2001; Featherstone and Radaelli 2003; Goetz and Hix 2001, Mény, Muller and Quermonne 1996). Though the scholars of the second wave has been able to identify factors and mechanisms that shape the adaptation and non-adaptation of the member states to the European Union, there are is still open questions, in particular with regard to the explanatory power of the dominant explanation - the goodness of fit. Therefore, the first section of the book moves beyond the goodness of fit explanations by focussing on indirect mechanisms. It is likely that member states had not always been aware of these indirect effects of European integration when they decided to delegate competencies to the EU level in the past. This might have lead to

unexpected Europeanization experiences that shape member states preferences towards further cooperation and integration. It is therefore important for the focus of this book to analyze these indirect effects in more detail.

Building on the knowledge about the significance of the indirect mechanisms, the book then turns to the third wave of research. Here the book draws on the traditional strength of comparative politics *and* international relations. Some theoretical work has just begun to call for ways to combine bottom-up theories of integration with the top-down theories of Europeanization. Börzel states “a comprehensive understanding of the relationship between the member states and the European Union requires the systematic integration of the two dimensions,” although she then proceeds to “mainly adopt a top-down perspective” (forthcoming). Börzel and Risse have also discussed the two perspectives and then state “As far as the European Union is concerned, we will get a more comprehensive picture if we study the feedback processes among and between the various levels of European, national, and subnational governance,” but then again take a ‘top-down’ perspective (Börzel and Risse, 2003: 57). In the same volume, Wincott states that “In the final analysis research on Europeanization should filter back into our understanding of what the European Union is (on an abstract level) and might even influence the process of European integration itself.” (2003: 282). We try here to move this debate further.

There are of course reasons, especially critical in empirical research, to restrict oneself to either a bottom-up or top-down approach to research on the EU and the member states. If both the dependent variable and the independent variable are changing at the same time, any hope of isolating causal factors is lost. But if we truly want to ‘understand the nature of the beast’ (Risse-Kappen 1996), the evolving multi-level political system of the EU and the member states, we must also acknowledge the interactive processes that feed back onto themselves.

We argue that it is possible to circumvent the problem by separating Europeanization and European integration chronologically. In other words to take a temporal approach and by explicitly asking - how has the Europeanization experience impacted on (the preferences for) modes of cooperation and integration among the member states. We suggest three mechanisms: socialisation, path dependency, and

learning. Before we elaborate on these mechanisms, we first turn to the first section of our book dealing with the Europeanization of member states.

Europeanization of the Member States

The focus of the book is on the turning point towards the third wave. This implies that we still need to revisit some issues of the second wave before we are able to move to the third wave. The reason being, that in order to analyze the question whether and how earlier Europeanization has affected (national preferences for) current modes of cooperation and integration it is necessary to have a good understanding of the extent to which the EU has impacted on the member states and the underlying mechanisms at work.¹ So far, this research has mainly focused on the goodness of fit between European requirements and the national status quo as an explanation for domestic policy change. However, empirical research has documented that the degree of Europeanization is not simply a function of the goodness of fit. It is true that at least some misfit is necessary for any *adjustment to* EU requirements to take place: without misfit adjustment is not logically possible. But, it is not true that misfit is a necessary condition for (any) domestic change. As for instance the case of the French transport policies in the 1990s illustrates, EU induced domestic change is possible even if there is a close fit between EU objectives and national status quo, if this change is *divergent* from the EU objectives (Knill and Lehmkuhl 2002: 261-2:). This is a process that has also been called retrenchment (Boerzel and Risse 2003).

Apart from this conceptual issue, it has been demonstrated that the explanatory power of the goodness of fit hypotheses is rather weak. The hypotheses that the larger the misfit, the less adjustment observed, has not been sufficiently supported by empirical research. Hence in many instance no adjustments occurred even in case of low misfit, while adjustment has taken place in cases of relatively large misfit (see for instance Haverland 2000, Knill and Lenschow 1998). The contributions in this section therefore go beyond the goodness of fit explanation by focusing on political preferences and

¹ There are many different usages of the term Europeanisation (for overviews, see Eising 2002, Olsen 2002, Radaelli 2002). Europeanisation is here broadly defined as the effect of European integration on the member states. European integration is characterised by two interrelated processes "the delegation of policy competencies to the supranational level to achieve particular policy outcomes; and the establishment of a new set of political institutions; with executive, legislative and judicial powers"(Hix and Goetz, 2000: 3).

indirect mechanism of Europeanization, in particular on changing opportunity structures and the framing of discourse.

Changing opportunity structures. The establishment of a new set of institutions at the European level with legislative, executive and judicial powers provides actors with a new layer of access to political decision making. The EU creates new exit, veto, and informational opportunities for domestic actors resulting into a redistribution of powers and resources of public and private actors in the member states (Börzel and Risse 2003; Hix and Goetz 2002; Knill and Lehmkuhl 2002). For instance, the single market increases the leverage of export-oriented business at the expense of import-competing firms (see for the general argument Keohane and Milner 1996) and arguably also the power of business interest association vis-à-vis the represents of diffused interests, such as environmental policy (Kohler-Koch 1996).

Framing. The other indirect mechanism refers to the cognitive impact of European integration and issues of framing. European integration may alter the beliefs and expectations of domestic actors within a given opportunity structure shaping their preferences and strategies. European integration may even lead to cognitive convergence, for instance about the appropriate mode of governance, (Börzel and Risse 2003, Kohler-Koch 2002, Knill and Lehmkuhl 2002; Radaelli 2000).

We now turn from this general discussion of the possible causal mechanisms for Europeanization to the empirical research in this volume. The section starts with a contribution by *Mastenbroek* and *Van Keulen* that provide for a comprehensive criticism of the notion of goodness of fit and then provide an alternative theory arguing that the fate of European policies depends on government preferences rather than the goodness if fit. They chose two cases from the Netherlands, the transposition of the 1998 gas directive and the transposition of the Biotech directive, that allow them to test both explanations in a competitive fashion.

Next *Stiller* analyses focuses more explicitly on the two indirect mechanisms elaborated above and analyses whether EU related arguments have been used to justify change in welfare state arrangements. She looks in particular at pension reform and employs a most similar system design, looking at Germany and Italy, two countries with similar pension systems and problems and a comparable number of veto players.

In a similar vein, *Kallestrup* combines the mechanisms of framing and changing opportunity structure asking to what extent and how Danish politicians and other actors make use of the EU in policy-making processes at the domestic levels. Using the technique of process tracing, he looks in particular whether Danish politicians have conceived and assessed EU policies at the domestic level and how they made use of EU policies and pressure to justify reforms to competition law and consumer protections laws in their country.

There is a certain bias in the Europeanization literature to study the effect of the EU on domestic policies, rather than on input processes such as cleavages, parties, and patterns of democratic legitimization (Hix and Goetz 2000: 15) However, in order to assess to what extent the Member States have Europeanized it is also important to evaluate whether and to what extent the EU had an effect beyond policies (political output). *Binnema* deals with one of the most important mass-elite linkage institutions in democracies, political parties. He analyses whether the EU had an effect on the three most important functions of political parties: aggregation, mobilization and recruitment. He does this for three different periods: around 1970, 1985 and 2000, first of all for 15 member states on a more general level and then in greater detail for The Netherlands, Denmark and Austria.

European Integration and Cooperation

Turning from the second wave to the third wave, the second section of the book deals with the question whether and how Europeanisation has in turn an effect on (the preferences for) future cooperation. It is important to note that our approach should not be conflated with neo-functional reasoning. To be sure, our attempt to link Europeanization and integration might sound reminiscent of the feedback loops and spillover effects of the much criticized neo-functional approach. Neo-functionalism conceived integration as moving forward from its own dynamic, albeit in fits and starts (Haas 1958). Integration was to occur through two kinds of ‘spillover’, functional and political. Whereas functional spillover referred to the interconnectedness of various economic processes with other societal processes and between issue areas, political

spillover referred to how supranational organizations tend to generate a self-reinforcing process of institution building.

But here we are not predicting a specific outcome of this process of integration. In particular, we do not posit that there is a process toward an ever closer European Union. Taking a historical perspective does not automatically lead to a specific expectation about the possible outcome. It does also not imply a particular causal mechanism at work. The Europeanization experience might feedback in various ways and with various effects. Below three different mechanisms are discussed drawing from insights from International Relations and Comparative Politics.

Socialization. Taking a sociological institutionalist perspective, one can hypothesize that over time member states have been socialized into European norms and have developed a European identity which results into a shared “European” understanding of interests, the problems at stake, and legitimate and workable solutions (Checkel 1999; March and Olsen 1989). In a similar vein Falkner argues “...preference formation is not necessarily exogenous to European integration...we cannot adequately understand EU treaty reform (and, indeed, European integration more generally) if we exclude instances of EU-level socialization and the institutionalization of policy paradigms” (2002, p. 8).

Path dependency. It is also possible to take an actor-oriented rational choice approach while being sensitive to the temporal dimension of politics. An actor-oriented historical institutionalist perspective would lead us to hypothesize ever closer integration as policy makers are increasingly constrained by the legacy of consequences of earlier effects of European integration which were often unforeseen and beyond their control (Pierson 1996). Likewise, Kohler-Koch argues that the effect of the deepening of earlier integration has increased the costs of non-decisions (Kohler-Koch 1996: 302).

Learning. It may also be the case that the current situation represents a critical juncture, a time at which it is possible to deviate from well-trodden paths. In addition, as attempts of cooperation moves into new areas, the path dependency argument is not likely to be applicable. Governments may desire more room to manoeuver in dealing with experiences with European integration. In weighting the costs and benefits of various alternatives of cooperation and integration, member states might learn from past

experiences of unexpected, indirect Europeanization beyond their control, and thus might now be more cautious when opting for supra-national modes of integration.

As research on these mechanisms in the context of the EU is still in its infancy we will not predict which of these mechanisms is dominant. However, the book is based on the assumption that the member states themselves have been transformed in the process of European integration, resulting in a change of preferences toward what they desire at the EU level and how the central institutions of the EU should develop further.

The section starts with a chapter by *Van Esch* focusing on the preferences of the German and French head of governments and ministers of finance concerning the establishment of a European economic and monetary union. Using cognitive mapping she analyses in particular their world view related to EMU. She compares the 1970s and the 1990s which allows her to compare periods with low and high degrees of European integration. She analyses whether and to what extent earlier effects of European integration have become part of their 'cognitive map'.

Turning from the impact of earlier integration effects on the world view of (members of) governments to its impact on revealed preferences, *Leuffen* and *Luitwieler* study whether the length of membership in the EU impacts on member states preferences with regard to five crucial issues in the European Convention. They argue that due to socialisation, older members will favour a more integrationist (or supra-national) institutional design, while new members are more in favour of a design safeguarding their national interests. They test their sociological institutionalist argument against a hypotheses derived from rational choice institutionalism. This hypothesis states that the size of the country explain its preference with regard to these issues. The authors look at the preferences of all 25 members of the convention and test their hypothesis quantitatively.

While *Leuffen* and *Luitwieler* take length of EU membership as a proxy for the experience of earlier integration effects, *Schäfer* analyses more concretely a sequence of Europeanisation and new modes of cooperation. Taking an actor-oriented historical institutionalist approach that takes into account government preferences and learning effects, he seeks to explain why the open method of coordination (OMC) was introduced to EU policy making. The OMC is a - currently much discussed - alternative to the

traditional community method. He analyzes to what extent and how the effects of prior integration, in particular EMU, have limited available choices in the area of employment policy and later in other socio-economic policy areas.

Conceptual Challenges

Overall, the chapters of the book document an increased interrelationship between the EU level and the domestic level. This in turn has implications for the reconfiguration of political power and rule within and without the European Union. In an attempt to address the latter issue, the third wave of European studies calls for a renewed exploration of the way scholars in EU-studies have traditionally imagined the concepts of identity, boundaries and order through the lens of sovereign states. The book therefore concludes with a conceptual reorientation.

In a sense, then, the third wave of EU-studies reopens for consideration the concerns of the first wave of theorists, which explicitly dealt with issues of sovereignty, identity, and territoriality. For instance, functionalists like Mitrany (1966) expected territorial orders and identities to fade out in favor of functional polities. Neo-functionalists and federalists foresaw a supranational Euro-state divided in respectively functional and territorial subunits, while realists and liberal intergovernmentalists assumed the nation state would remain. However, this first wave of EU-studies effectively narrowed the question of sovereignty down to a simple yes or no answer. However, such an approach seems too coarse for analyses that seek to trace the more fine-grained changes in the meaning and significance of sovereignty in arresting the thinking about identity, boundaries and orders. The subsequent studies of Europeanization have often taken boundaries between the EU and its member states and the EU and its environment for granted. Thus, they cannot account for shifts in territorial rule and the changing nature of boundaries. The third wave of EU studies should therefore put forward the conceptual and theoretical devices to address the dynamic interplay between boundaries, identity and order.

Thus the final section of this volume on the next generation of EU-studies subsequently deals with the impact of European integration and Europeanization on

internal boundaries (*Vollaard*), external boundaries (*van Munster* and *Sterkx*), and the guiding principle of Europe's territorial order - sovereignty (*Aalberts*). *Vollaard* illustrates in the case of the European health card how the unfreezing of Member States' borders may lead both to the political reconfiguration of member states and the European Union. *Van Munster* and *Sterkx* evaluate the ways in which the externalisation of European migration policies exports the Union's structures of governance beyond its member states. *Aalberts* concludes the section with a social-constructivist argument on how European integration and Europeanization result in the changing meaning and significance of sovereignty.

Methodological Considerations

Regardless of whether authors focus on the effect of the EU on the member states or the effect of previous instances of Europeanization on (preferences) for future integration, they all demonstrate both a high level of methodological reflection and rigor in method application to ensure valid and reliable results. This methodological awareness is a response to recent claims that theoretical progress in EU studies should be matched with higher methodological consciousness (*Andersen 2003; Haverland 2003*).

The authors of the (comparative) case studies in this volume (*Mastenbroeck/Keulen, Stiller, Kallestrup, Binnema, van Esch*) are fully aware that the problem of (internal) validity looms large in small 'n' designs. Therefore each of them follow a carefully constructed most similar systems design. Cases are selected intentionally in a manner that ensures that potentially theoretically meaningful variables are held 'constant' to rule out that they confound the causal effect of the study variable, i.e. the independent variable in which the author is interested (*Frendreis 1983; Lijphart 1971*). At the same time the cases exhibit a maximum variation of the independent variable which prevents the problem of selection bias (*King, Keohane et al. 1994*). The author of the single historical case study (*Schaefer*), carefully identifies a number of observable implications from the two theories he studies and then proceeds in a pattern matching mode taking into account the timing and sequences of events (*Yin 1994*).

In order to assess the overall impact of the European integration and Europeanization respectively, some case oriented researchers ask the counterfactual

question: what would have happened in the domestic area of interest in the absence of the EU (see also Anderson 2003, Haverland 2003a, 2003b). This additional device to increase the internal validity is necessary as it is difficult to establish the strength of causal effect of the European Union when focusing on indirect mechanisms.

Europeanization research is not always aware of this difficulty and generally suffers from a bias towards EU level explanations. Domestic change and continuity is too quickly attributed to the European Union, alternative explanations are not taken into account.

Large ‘n’ research has typically less problems with internal validity. The authors that use a quantitative large ‘n’ design (*Leuffen* and *Luitwieler*) therefore reflect in particular on concept validity which is often at risk when relative ‘simple’ quantitative indicators have to be developed to test relatively complex theories.

Regardless of the research design chosen all authors pay due notice to the issue of replicability and reliability. They are all explicit about their hypotheses, their operationalization, the source of their data and the methods of data analysis. In order to avoid (unsystematic) measurement errors they typically tap diverging sources in a triangulative fashion (King, Keohane et al. 1994; Yin 1994).

Conclusion

In lieu of a separate chapter at the end of this volume, we would like to summarize our main results here. First, we will emphasize the results that emerge from the rich empirical research of the chapters contained in the three sections of the book and indicate how this work has begun to answer our main question – how has Europeanization affected current modes of integration and cooperation among the member states? Secondly, we will use our cork screw model to speculate as to why we think the modes of integration and cooperation may have changed over time. This will lay out a fruitful area for future research.

In the first section of the book on Europeanisation, *Mastenbroek* and *van Keulen* have tested the dominant explanation ‘goodness of fit’, against their own explanation based on government preferences. Their results are in line with the preference-based explanations. The Netherlands was in favour of the Gas directive and transposed it successfully, despite a large misfit, while the transposition of the unwanted Biotech

directive was a failure, though here the misfit was much smaller and they even argue probably non-existent. Next, *Stiller's* study on the framing of pension reform in Italy and Germany found that domestic actors in Italy used the EU to justify reforms, whereas actors in Germany did not use the EU in this way. She points towards the general popularity of the EU as an important scope condition for framing to work. The Italian government could tap into a high level of support for the EU, Germany could not.

Contrary to the German pension case, *Kallestrup* finds for the case of Danish consumer and competition policy domestic actors made intensive use of the changed opportunity structures afforded by the EU by pointing to Europe even in regard to national competition policy, where no EU obligations exist. The EU was for instance used to prolong the decision-making process and to delimit the scope of the debate. He also finds that the selective use of the EU as an argument is more important than 'goodness of fit' when explaining the reform of regulatory policy. As in the Dutch case (*Mastenbroek* and *van Keulen*) the degree of misfit is not correlated with the degree of adaptation. Finally, *Binnema* finds that existing national parties have adapted quite well to the existence of the EU, and have extended their influence to this new arena by adaptation of their party programs and recruitment strategies. This Europeanization research allows for the following conclusion. The goodness of fit between EU requirements or suggested models with the national status quo does not account for cross-national variation in adaptation to the EU. Rather, the preferences of governments are a crucial factor. Governments get their way by strategically and selectively using the new opportunity to frame a topic in a 'European' way.

Turning to our next section on European integration and cooperation, we started with *van Esch's* chapter that uses cognitive mapping to compare the worldviews of domestic actors in the late 1960s with the late 1980s regarding EMU. Her research provides support for the hypothesis that as European integration moves forward, the worldviews on which central decision-makers base their preferences have become more Europeanized. Interestingly though, the inclusion of earlier EU integration effects in the cognitive map does not automatically lead to a pro-European stance. The French president Pompidou was strongly against the establishment of (true) EMU but his view is more Europeanised than that of the pro-European advocate D'Estaing. This suggests that

sometimes learning rather than socialisation mechanisms - as defined in this introduction - are at work.

The results of *Leuffen* and *Luitwieler* suggest, however, that generally speaking EU membership does socialise governments into a more pro-European stance. Their analysis with regard to crucial issues of the European Convention reveals that the length of membership impacts state preferences for further integration. They conclude that the longer a country is a member of the EU, the more it is socialized into the EU and that this is reflected in their preferences for the institutional design for integration. More specifically, they found that long standing members favor more democratic voting rights in the Council of Ministers based on population, whereas newer members favored institutional designs that emphasize the equality of states. Their alternative explanation drawing from rational choice institutionalism that state size determines the preferences did not receive much empirical support.

That it is not only a question of socialisation is suggested by the results of *Schaefer's* study on the Open Method of Coordination. He finds that the decision for the OMC is a result of a constraint set by EMU (hence an earlier instance of EU integration), and the political color of governments across the EU, which influences not only the policy aims but also the mode of integration in the EU. Thus, while a conservative – liberal coalition at Maastricht created a mode of decision-making for fiscal and monetary policy in the EU to constrain successive national governments, a social democratic majority at Amsterdam relied on soft law to promote its goals in employment and social policy. By implication, this latter mode of integration avoided sovereignty losses for national governments, and helped maintain the control of national actors.

The final section of the book turns to re-evaluate central concepts of EU studies and international relations as a result of the third wave of research linking bottom up and top-down approaches. *Vollaard*, in his research on healthcare, finds that multi-level governance is beginning to break down conceptions of territoriality in critical components of the social welfare state by giving citizens the option of temporary exit to receive care abroad. He writes that the conception of territoriality is then re-emerging at the EU level. In contrast, *Munster* and *Sterkx* find that the EU's externalization of migration policy, pushing policies out by encouraging countries which border on the EU

to tighten border controls, constitutes a deterritorialized response to migration issues. Finally, *Aalberts* finds that the constructivist perspective of the mutual construction of structure and agency helps member states maintain the principle of sovereignty within the realities of multi-level political governance structures.

One of the general research findings of the book is the great importance of domestic governments for understanding the link between Europeanization and subsequent modes of integration and cooperation. Many contributions have shown that member state governments are capable of controlling the degree and type of Europeanization and are aware of future Europeanization effects when favouring certain EU decision modes over others.

More specifically, *Mastenbroek* and *van Keulen* find the preferences of national political actors critical to the successful transformation of directives, both *Stiller* and *Kallestrup* find national actors may creatively use arguments about the EU to press for domestic reforms, and *Binnema* finds national political parties adapting by maintaining and extending their role as intermediaries between society and government in the new multi-level system of governance. *Van Esch's* study suggest that the world view of governments has become more Europeanised, but that member states can learn different things from earlier instances of EU integration. *Schaefer* shows how the political color of the majority of governments across the EU influences the mode of decision making chosen for new areas of integration and cooperation. He explains that this is an attempt to steer the Europeanization impacts onto the member states and the loss of sovereign decision-making. Once again, the changing, more Europeanized preferences of national actors is shown to be critical in explaining preferences for further integration and cooperation. Generally speaking, we found an effect of Europeanization on member-states preferences, but there were different mechanisms at work and member state governments are able to mediate this effect.

The result of this decades long process of Europeanization and integration, and the continued development of multi-level governance, is the beginning of the de-territorialization of some decision-making at the national level, for example as *Vollaard* shows for healthcare policy. In some policy areas, for example in migration policy researched by *Munster* and *Sterkx*, decision-making has not only re-territorialized at the

EU level, but the EU has begun to push policies onto neighboring countries. Finally, this deepening and integration in multi-level governance, continues to occur while the member states continue to view themselves as sovereign, a constructivist turn in the research undertaken by *Aalberts*.

Now we turn to the speculative part of our conclusion, that moves beyond the research results presented here to lay out a fruitful area for future research. One of the main results of the empirical research presented here is that there is not a development towards an ever-closer union in the way neo-functionalists originally imagined, but that national actors continue to play a strong role in determining the degree of integration and cooperation and the resultant Europeanization impacts onto the member states. The dual processes of European integration and Europeanization are thus not continuing in a single trajectory. Europeanization does not automatically result in a single type of European integration driven forward primarily by the supranational institutions of the EU, but instead national actors continue to play a strong role in deciding on the mode of integration and cooperation. Now we ask, why has there been such a wide variety of modes of integration and cooperation over the decades long development of the European Union?

Let us begin here with a model we briefly mentioned at the beginning of the introduction. One way to conceive of the dual processes of Europeanization and European integration is to imagine a rotating cork-screw lying on its side. Each upward rotation of the cork-screw represents a particular aspect of European integration, the subsequent movement downward represents the resulting impact on the member states - Europeanization. A particular action can either begin from the bottom-up from the member states themselves (intergovernmentally), or at the top from the supranational institutions of the EU itself (supranationally).

Early integration of the EC in the 1950s and 1960s, for example in Coal and Steel entailed minimal Europeanization impacts on the member states in one policy field. The process though quickened and intensified through the 1970s and 1980s with increased integration and increased Europeanization, leading to the development of a multi-level system of governance. Thus when we look at these dual processes over time it appears that although there are periods of faster and slower rotations, there has been a general

trajectory since the earliest stages of the European project until the late 1980's of successively faster rotations. This represents increased activity for European integration and subsequent Europeanization impacts onto the member states. This process was propelled forward by a general consensus, it least by the national actors in the governments in power at the time, that clear economic gains could be achieved by the creation of a single market.

However, after the basic completion of the Single Market in the early 1990s, many of the newer forms of integration and cooperation look quite different than those in the earlier period. It is as if the corkscrew has been profoundly transformed, and subsequent forward progress was splintered in different directions. Some strands of the rotating corkscrew, imagine a thick strand of the corkscrew, proceeded with a high degree of integration and high Europeanization impacts. That is the case, for example, for the creation of a single currency among 12 of the 15 countries (see chapter *van Esch* and also *Schaefer*). But other types of interaction among the member states have been through much looser forms of cooperation, such as bench-marking and other forms of soft-cooperation between member states (see chapter *Schäfer*). Here one might imagine a thin line spiraling upwards, representing the agreement to discuss and cooperate, but only a dashed lined spiraling downward, representing the limited and voluntary impact back onto the member states of this degree of cooperation. This represents looser types of integration and more minimal impacts of Europeanization. Finally, we also note the increased use of pioneer groups within the EU, where only certain countries agree to cooperate and integrate their policies. The Schengen agreement on border controls is a case in point. Here we might imagine a dashed spiral line upwards toward the EU and a similar one down again onto the member states, because only some EU countries agreed to this kind of cooperation and its subsequent impacts onto the state.

We posit that whereas a quickening spiral of integration on one hand and Europeanization on the other characterized the period from the 1950's through the goal of creating a single market in the late 1980's, the lack of democratic legitimacy for the EU project has resulted in the trajectory of integration and Europeanization in the 1990's to

be quite different than earlier periods.² The current period of cooperation and integration among Europeanized states is thus characterized by larger variation and generally looser types of cooperation which allow the member states a greater degree of control over the impact of these policies on the member states - thus their Europeanization. Some of these new forms of cooperation began earlier, but their use has now been extended to many more areas than before.

We suspect that the distinction between input-oriented authenticity (*government by the people*) and output-oriented effectiveness (*government for the people*) is crucial to an understanding of the current modes of cooperation and integration among Europeanized states (Scharpf, 1999). Given clear overall economic gains of the single market program, output-oriented legitimacy was sufficiently high across Europe to propel the European project forward through the 1980's. Moreover, (economic) "integration could largely be advanced by negative integration pushed by the Commission and the Court, as it were behind the back of politically legitimized actors" (Scharpf 1999: 71). Furthermore, in addition to output legitimacy, the EU likely also benefited from a general sense of input legitimacy nurtured by a feeling of belonging to the Western political community during the period of the Cold War.

However, the situation seems to have now changed. Since the creation of the Single Market in the late 1980s and early 1990s, the mode of decision-making in new areas, such as pensions and social security, efforts to combat unemployment, immigration, and security and defense, is quite different. In these areas, there are minimal, or at least not immediately obvious economic gains to integration. Moreover, supranational integration in these areas is more visible to the public and demand positive integration, hence explicit approval by the Council of Ministers and, increasingly, the European Parliament. Thus, tacit approval is no longer sufficient for forward progress to occur, instead an "action consensus is needed among a wide range of divergent national and group interests" (Scharpf 1999: 71). In addition, after the fall of the wall and the collapse of communism in Eastern Europe, perhaps general input legitimacy from the

² This is not to say that there was a strictly linear development towards deeper integration and stronger Europeanisation during the first four decades of integration. But this was certainly the general trend. There was no large variation in the modes of integration and cooperation. The community method was the prime mode of policy making.

Western political community has diminished. For both reasons, nationally elected leaders need new sources of input-oriented legitimacy, at least for areas beyond economic and monetary policy where output legitimacy can be more easily secured.

Given the lack of input legitimacy, it is likely that further integration in non-economic areas can only be achieved through institutional means that allow national elites to better control, monitor, and evaluate the impact of proposals on their country and thus to better steer the process of Europeanization. Thus the insufficient degree of input oriented legitimacy as decision-making moves from the single market project toward non-economic (positive) integration is a reason for the spiral of integration to be splintering into many different modes. New forms of cooperation are emerging in the EU, such as benchmarking in socio-economic policy and enhanced cooperation in defense and security, which are more voluntary and less binding, because there is a lack of legitimacy to go further.

It follows that only if we see a greater Europeanization of the key democratic institutions of the member states, such as within national parliaments, national election campaigns, or generally in the democratic discourses between national actors and the citizens, would it be possible for European integration to continue in the ways it did in the prime years of integration. Another possibility would be a strengthening of democratic institutions at the EU level, for example strengthening the European parliament or increasing the transparency of the decision-making within the Council of Ministers.

Without democratic legitimacy over decision-making, either at the level of the member states or at the EU level itself, the kind of European integration pursued during the peak period of the European project is no longer sustainable. Instead other types of decision-making in place of the community method will increasingly be used, which give more control to national governments and which give national democratic processes and discourses within national electorates an opportunity to take place.

Bibliography

- Anderson, J. (2003). Europeanization in context. Germany, Europe and the Politics of Constraint. K. Dyson and G. Klaus. Oxford, Oxford UP & British Academy: 37-53.
- Andersen, S. S. (2003). 'On a clear day you can see the EU'. Case study methodology in the EU research. ARENA working paper 16/03. Oslo.
- Börzel, T. A. (forthcoming). How the European Union Interacts with its Member States. Member States and the European Union. S. Bulmer and C. Lequesne. Oxford, Oxford UP.
- Börzel, Tanja A., and Thomas Risse. (2003): Conceptualising the Domestic Impact of Europe. In The Politics of Europeanisation, edited by K. Featherstone and C. Radaelli. Oxford, 55-78.
- Checkel, J. T. (1999). "Social Construction and Integration." Journal of European Public Policy 6(4): 545-560.
- Cowles, Maria, and James Caporaso and Thomas Risse, eds. (2001) Transforming Europe: Europeanization and Domestic Change. (Ithaca and London: Cornell)
- Eising, R. (2003). Europäisierung und Integration. Konzepte in der EU-Forschung. Europäische Integration. M. Jachtenfuchs and B. Kohler-Koch. Opladen, Leske + Budrich UTB: 387-416.
- Falkner, G. (2002). "Introduction: EU treaty reform as a three-level process." Journal of European Public Policy 9(1): 1-11.
- Featherstone, Kevin and Claudio Radaelli, eds. (2003). The Politics of Europeanization. (Oxford and New York: Oxford).
- Frendreis, J. P. (1983). "Explanation of Variation and Detection of Covariation. The Purpose and Logic of Comparative Analysis." Comparative Political Studies 16(2): 255-272.
- Goetz, Klaus and Simon Hix, eds. (2001). Europeanized Politics? European integration and National Political Systems. (London: Frank Cass).
- Haas, E. B. (1958). The Uniting of Europe. Political, Social and Economic Forces, 1950-1957. Stanford, Stanford UP.
- Haverland, M. (2000). "National adaptation to the European Union. The importance of institutional veto points." Journal of Public Policy 20(1): 83-103.
- Haverland, M. (2003). Methodological issues in Europeanization research. Paper prepared for presentation at ECPR General Conference, Marburg.
- Haverland, M. (2003). The impact of the European Union on national environmental policies. The Politics of Europeanization. K. Featherstone and C. Radaelli. Oxford, Oxford University Press: 203-221.
- Hix, Simon, and Klaus H. Goetz. (2000) Introduction: European Integration and National Political Systems. West European Politics, Special Issue 23 (4): 1-26.
- Holzacker, Ronald (2002) "National Parliamentary Scrutiny over EU Issues," European Union Politics 3 (4): 459-479.

- Hooghe, L. & G. Marks (2001): Multilevel Governance and European Integration, Oxford: Rowman and Littlefield.
- King, G., R. O. Keohane, et al. (1994). Designing Social Inquiry. Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research. Princeton, Princeton UP.
- Knill, C. and A. Lenschow (1998). "Coping with Europe: the impact of British and German administrations on the implementation of EU environmental policy." Journal of European Public Policy 5(4): 595-614.
- Knill, C. and D. Lehmkuhl (2002). "The national impact of European Union regulatory policy: three Europeanization mechanisms." European Journal of Political Research 41: 255-280.
- Kohler-Koch, B. (2002). "European Networks and Ideas: Changing National Policies?" European Integration online Papers 6(6).
- Lijphart, A. (1971). "Comparative Politics and Comparative Method." American Political Science Review 65: 682-693.
- Kohler-Koch, B., Ed. (2003). Linking EU and National Governance. Oxford, Oxford UP.
- Lindberg, L. L. and S. A. Scheingold, Eds. (1971). Regional Integration. Theory and Research. Cambridge, Harvard UP.
- March, J. and J. Olsen (1989). Rediscovering Institutions. The Organizational Basis of Politics. London, Macmillan.
- Mény, Y., P. Muller, et al., Eds. (1996). Adjusting to Europe. The Impact of the European Union on National Institutions and Policies. London and New York, Routledge.
- Mitrany, D. (1966) "The Prospect of Integration: Federal or Functional" Journal of Common Market Studies 4(2), 119-49.
- Moravcsik, A.(1999): The Choice for Europe: Social Purpose and State Power From Rome to Maastricht, Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Olsen, Johan P. (2002): The Many Faces of Europeanization. Journal of Common Market Studies 40 (5): 921-950.
- Pierson, P. (1996). "The Path to European Integration. A Historical Institutional Analysis." Comparative Political Studies 29(2): 123-163.
- Radaelli, Claudio (2000): Whither Europeanization? Concept stretching and substantive change, in: European integration online Papers 4(8), <http://eiop.or.at/eiop/texte/2000>.
- Risse-Kappen, Thomas (1996). 'Exploring the Nature of the Beast; International Relations Theory and Comparative Policy Analysis Meet the European Union,' Journal of Common Market Studies 34 (1), pp. 53-80.
- Scharpf, Fritz W. (1999): Governing Europe. Effective and Legitimate? Oxford.
- Stone Sweet, A., & W. Sandholtz, (eds. 1998): Supranational Governance: The Institutionalization of the European Union, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wincott, D. (2003). The Idea of the European Social Model: Limits and Paradoxes of Europeanization. The Politics of Europeanization. K. Featherstone and C. M. Radaelli. Oxford, Oxford UP: 279-302.

Yin, R. K. (1994). Case Study Research and Method. 2nd edition. Thousand Oaks, London, New Dehli, Sage.