

A Mosaic Of The Concept Of Europeanization?

(Broad but practical)

Murad Nasibov

Centre for Social Policy Development,
Baku, Azerbaijan

Introduction

Over the past decade, there has been a dramatic increase in the number of papers written on the concept Europeanization. However, the relevant literature is rather fragmented in this regard, suggesting a large amount of different definitions. There is, however, no prevailing conception of Europeanization. This term was popularly used in academic writings of the mid-1990s and mid-2000s. This popularity can be attributed to the two rounds of enlargement - towards Austria, Finland and Sweden in 1995 and Eastern Europe in 2004 and 2007. To date there has been little agreement on *'what changes'*. Different conceptions of Europeanization address different dimensions of it. None of them are able to wholly explain the phenomenon alone. Another issue is that while some of them include fewer variables for the sake of parsimony and are thus easily applied in cases, others are lost in complexity with almost no use in practice.

Considering possible difficulties which can arise in the case of application or in the impossibility this, it has been implicitly concluded that providing a mega conception of Europeanization has or may have no prospect other than being useless. Adopting this point of view or confessing my inability to claim to the contrary in embarrassment, I suggest a mosaic of the concept of Europeanization. By introducing the mosaic of the concept of Europeanization, the aim of this paper is to bring more practicality, concreteness and clarification to the literature on Europeanization. The mosaic will be constructed from among the aspects of different usages of Europeanization which are considered to be identifying knowledge of those variants of the concept. Such a mosaic will also highlight many questions for further research. To some extent, if it is successful, this paper will also serve as a complement to the works of Olsen (2001) and Harmsen and Wilson (2000).

This work is conditioned upon a few statements. First, Europeanization is not restricted to the EU and did not begin with that. Second, with the creation of the European Union, the Europeanization process gained pace. Today it is more and more dependent on the EU. In other words, the EU actions and its presence constitute the source of Europeanization.

Chapter 1 begins by laying out the theoretical dimensions of the concept. Initially, it deliberates the differences between concept and conception, their relations and the benefits of drawing lines between these two. Subsequently, the concept and conception differentiation will be discussed in the context of Europeanization. In the chapter that follows, different usages of the concept of Europeanization and their aspects taken as identifying knowledge of the concept will be elaborated. Later, based on these aspects, the mosaic of the concept of Europeanization will be constructed. Finally, the differences between the two concepts of European integration / EU external governance and Europeanization will be explored.

Most of the works in the field have dealt with the nature of Europeanization, its methods and outcomes. Others address the issues of change in domestic institutions, actors, procedures and paradigms or the impact of the EU on new member states or beyond the EU. Only a few authors deal with the issue of research design in Europeanization, namely, Exadaktylos and Radelli, Graziano and Vink, and Haverland. This article is written in the awareness of trade-offs in research design in Europeanization presented by Exadaktylos and Radelli (2009).

Chapter 1: Drawing Lines Between ‘Concept’ And ‘Conception’ In Europeanization

Before moving on to the discussion on the conception of Europeanization, it is worth addressing the issue of difference between the concept and the conception in Europeanization. Higginbotham makes a threefold distinction between possessing a concept, having the conception of the concept and having a conscious view of it (Ezcurdia, 1998: p. 187). In Fodor’s account, concept is a ‘mental representation *M*... which has as its content the property *P*’ and ‘*P* is analytic to or constitutive of the concept *M* (ibid.). Having a conception is also distinguished by having a conception of what constitutes the content of the concept. Ezcurdia puts it as ‘having a conception (of *P*) associated with the concept (*M*) which one takes to be analytic to or constitutive of that concept (*M*) (ibid.). Making the concept-conception distinction allows for accounts of (a) the public or intersubjective character of concepts and (b) a certain normative aspect involved in possessing a concept. It also emphasizes the possibility of misapplying a concept one possesses

and underwrites possession-mastery distinction. Subjects can possess a concept without necessarily having the complete (or to the necessary degree) the conception of the concept, and in such situations, subjects can misapply those concepts (ibid. p. 188).

In Higginbotham's explanation, having a conception is (i) what purports to give a subject individuating knowledge of the content of concepts and (ii) what actually gives her cognitive causal powers with respect to them. The subject has a conception in a certain conscious or tacit epistemic state. Consciously or unconsciously, the subject chooses some of his knowledge and ignores others. This conscious or tacit epistemic condition is constitutive of the conception. What is called to be a certain normative aspect is considered to be the identifying knowledge of the concept (ibid. 189).

Accordingly, there is no need to possess only true thoughts of the entities for having full knowledge of a concept, being fully competent and mastering a concept. However, there are a significant number of reasons (which are not the subjects of the paper) to argue that the author makes a mistake by claiming (implicitly) to the possibility of having full knowledge of a concept. While the possibility of deciding on having full knowledge is under the question, and there is no known mechanism for determining the extent of knowledge, it is more logical to replace the word 'full' with 'partial' in the statement above made by the author.

In our case, we have the concept (mental representation) – Europeanization, the conscious view of it (as it is a transformation process into situations/states which are '*European*' but not necessarily produced only by the Europeans) and partial conception of the concept. The emergence of different definitions of Europeanization results from the fact that different authors choose different entities falling under the concept. As the entities falling under the concept and the conception of those entities are analytical to or constitutive of the concept, nothing is usual more than to see different definitions being suggested. Different authors take different knowledge as identifying. In other words, different authors are in different conscious or tacit epistemic states, while having the conception of Europeanization. Consequently, different definitions of the conception of Europeanization arise in the literature.

These different definitions and the fact that many, if not all, of them are successfully applied make it reasonable to raise the question of to what extent it can be successful to claim that there is a certain normative aspect involved in possessing a concept. So, having such a broad concept, Europeanization puts a real problem in front of each scholar who engages particularly with European studies,

but also all those who are in the fields of political science, international relations and philosophy. This chapter explains the main reason of the reluctance of scholars in working on a mega conception of Europeanization, too.

As stated above, this paper will show how the mosaic of the concept of Europeanization constructed from the different definitions of that concept (considering that it is resulted from the differences in choosing entities and having different conceptions of those entities) is valuable in understanding Europeanization as a whole. From the discussions above, it is now much clearer what the advantages of the mosaic are. The mosaic of the concept of Europeanization will put together a wide range of aspects of the concept, which are regarded as identifying knowledge of the concept by different authors. Such a set of knowledge can be seen as the identifying knowledge of a mega conception of Europeanization. Thus, it will increase our cognitive causal power with respect to the concept, too.

Chapter 2: The Mosaic Of The Concept Of Europeanization

Although a considerable amount of literature has been published on Europeanization, very different phenomena are referred to by the term. While some of them such as Hix and Goetz are more precise in their definitions, defining it as 'a process of change in national institutional and policy practices that can be attributed to European integration' (2000: p. 27), others such as Ladrech (1994) deploy quite broad definitions, including also citizenship and national identity. Being concerned about the situation in the field of Europeanization, some scholars attempted to categorize definitions. In this uncertainty, two pieces of work – one of which was written by Olsen and other by Harmsen and Wilson- are very useful while deliberating on the subject. Olsen identifies five usages of the term Europeanization: (i) *Europeanization as changes in external territorial boundaries*. This aspect concerns the territorial reach of a system of governance and the degree of becoming a single political space. In other words, it involves but is not restricted to the EU's enlargement or integration beyond the enlargement. The EU is not the only but the strongest and most developed platform for a single political space. Instead, the EU and other organizations in Europe jointly constitute this single political space. (ii) *Europeanization as the development of institutions of governance at the European level*. This aspect involves the creation of a political centre – formal institutions providing coherence and coordination – of the European governance. It is closely related to the first aspect of Europeanization. This aspect also entails the delegation of some power from nation-states to the centre. At this point, the distinction between European integration and

Europeanization fades. (iii) *Europeanization as the central penetration of national and subnational systems of governance* refers to the division of responsibility and power between national and sub-national levels of governance. It is, in other words, a domestic change caused by integration relations. (iv) *Europeanization as exporting forms of political organization and governance typical and distinct for Europe beyond the European territory*. The fourth aspect of Europeanization concerns the relations with non-European actors and institutions. In these relations, it considers a more positive export/import balance as non-European countries import more from Europe than vice versa. Thus, Europe becomes more influential in international relations. (v) The last aspect of the term Europeanization signifies the degree to which Europe is becoming a more important political entity (Olsen, 2002: p. 3-4).

Such a list of uses of the term Europeanization is very limited, as it includes merely political aspects of Europeanization such as a single political space, domestic changes in power sharing between national and subnational levels caused by integration, creation of a political centre and delegation of power from nation-states to the European centre. The last aspect differs from the rest in terms of being rather normative.

Political integration of European and neighbouring countries, changes to the domestic politics resulting from this integration, and a more integrated and thus stronger Europe are adopted as identifying knowledge of the concept in these five variants of Europeanization. As identifying knowledge, these aspects make the concept of Europeanization indistinguishable from the European integration. Harmsen and Wilson provide two significant factors differentiating the two concepts of Europeanization and European integration. Accordingly, Europeanization is a two-way process as parallel and interconnected changes proceed at both the national and supranational levels. Meanwhile, the idea of European integration, as suggested by its etymology, is primarily concerned with the construction of a European 'centre', or perhaps a European 'whole'. The second distinctive feature of the concept of Europeanization is that it puts emphasis on the interrelationships between institutions and identities, while European integration tends to assume a rather technocratic form (Harmsen and Wilson, 2000: pp. 19-20). It is obvious from the discussion above that in the five types of usage of the term, it is synonymous to the concept of European integration.

In comparison with the five ways of usage of the concept of Europeanization, the eight ways identified by Harmsen and Wilson are quite broad, including the reconstruction of identity and cultural integration. (i) *Europeanization as the emergence of new forms of European governance*. This usage emphasizes the

socialization potential of institutions, redefinition of conceptions and relations, and restructure of power at both the national and supranational levels. (ii) *Europeanization as national adaptation*. Europeanization here refers to the adaptation of national institutional structures and policy-making processes in response to the development of European integration. (iii) *Europeanization as policy isomorphism*. This variant of Europeanization is concerned with the degree of convergence in substantive policy areas, being two-dimensional: direct and indirect. Direct convergence refers to the pass of regulatory competence from the member states to the European Union, while indirect convergence considers the emulation of one another by the member states in particular policy choices. (iv) *Europeanization as a problem and opportunity for the domestic political management*. In this usage, Europeanization is understood in terms of the problems which it poses and the opportunities which it creates for domestic political management, insofar that it confronts governments with policy choices that fall outside of established domestic parameters. (v) *Europeanization as modernization*. This usage of the concept is applied in the context of the more geographically peripheral and less economically developed member states of the European Union. Besides, it is also applied in the context of neighbourhood countries. (vi) *Europeanization as 'joining Europe'*. This variant of usage concerns EU enlargement towards the Central and Eastern European countries. (vii) *Europeanization as reconstruction of identities*. This is the broadest usage of Europeanization. It refers to the reshaping of identities in contemporary Europe in a manner which minimizes (without necessarily supplanting) national identities. (viii) *Europeanization as transnationalism and cultural integration*. This usage of Europeanization signifies spheres of interaction between the peoples of Europe. It is related to the reconstruction of identities (Harmsen and Wilson, 2000: pp. 14-18).

In these usages of Europeanization, identifying knowledge of the concept differs in a wide range. Besides those which take different aspects of political integration (restructure of power at the national and supranational levels, policy-making and institutional adaptation, convergence in policy areas and EU enlargement) as identifying knowledge of the concept, there are also variants of the concept which consider social aspects such as reconstruction of identities, cultural integration, the socialization potential of institutions and redefinition of conceptions and relations.

These different aspects do not contradict each other. Rather, they are closely interrelated. Nor there is any exclusiveness between the group of political aspects and social aspects. Instead, they are complementary to each other. At this point, it is worth noting that research on the interrelationships between social and political changes in Europe or its peripheries in the context of Europeanization can bridge the current gap in the literature and substantiate the statement made above. Each of

the variants addresses the transformation in different fields and considers a certain kind of change. Altogether, they bring about a historical transformation in a certain part of Europe or the European periphery. Such a historical transformation proceeds in all ways of life.

As a result, a mosaic of the concept of Europeanization with six aspects was constructed. These aspects were drawn from among the entities of the variants of the concept of Europeanization discussed above. While defining these aspects, all efforts have been made towards the purpose of achieving a concept with maximum practicality. To this end, some of them were ignored. These are EU enlargement, cultural integration, modernization and a single political space. The reason is that they are too broad to include other aspects with less or no practicality. Europeanization is not limited to the enlargement process; rather, it goes beyond enlargement. The first three aspects in Table 1 – adaptation in institutional structures and policy-making, convergence in substantive policy areas, and development of institutions at the European level and power sharing among supranational, national and subnational levels – bring about integration into the European Union or further integration within EU member-states. Meanwhile, cultural integration is too broad a concept to be applied in actual cases. However, it is obvious that such integration includes adoption of democratic principles and humanist values, which in its turn leads to redefinition of conceptions, reconstruction of identity and discourse: in other words, social change. Social change is followed in the political/governance field. Similarly, modernization is understood in the context of Europeanization. In short, the mosaic of the concept of Europeanization or Europeanization with six aspects brings practicality by ignoring broad aspects. However, as it is explained above, these broad aspects consist of the aspects from among the six provided below. Such a listing, though, cannot claim to be exhaustive.

Table 1. The mosaic of the concept of Europeanization

EUROPEANIZATION
Adaptation in institutional structures and policy-making process
Convergence in substantive policy cares
Development of institutions at the European level and power sharing among supranational, national and subnational levels
Socialization of institutions
Redefinition of conceptions
Reconstruction of identity and discourse

Another advantage of the mosaic of the concept of Europeanization is that it clarifies relations between the three concepts – Europeanization, European integration and EU external governance. Not contradicting the two factors differentiating Europeanization and European integration, the mosaic of the concept of Europeanization includes in itself the latter. While EU external governance concerns the relations of the EU with third countries, the concept of Europeanization involves transformation both within and outside the EU.

Dealing with '*the mechanisms of Europeanization*' as suggested in the literature will bring more clarification to the relations between Europeanization and European integration and EU external governance. Again, several different phenomena are considered under the term of mechanisms. Regarding the influence of the EU in these three processes, Grabbe provides five categories of mechanisms of Europeanization (2001: p. 1019):

- Gate-keeping access to negotiations and further stages in the accession process;
- Benchmarking and monitoring;
- Provision of legislative and institutional templates;
- Aid and technical assistance;
- Advice and twinning.

On the other hand, Coppieters *et al.* refer to two distinct terms as mechanisms of Europeanization: conditionality (almost the same with the first mechanism provided by Grabbe) and socialization process (2004). Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier add one more mechanism – lesson-drawing along with external incentive (conditionality) and social learning (socialization) as models of EU external governance (2004).

However, the problem here is that by accepting the existence of or the claim that there are mechanisms of Europeanization, the concept of Europeanization as a policy conducted and dominated by the EU is also accepted implicitly. The social aspects of mosaic of the concept of Europeanization constructed above object to such a possibility. If those special aspects are excluded from the list, then no difference is left between Europeanization and European integration.

To substantiate this claim, it is worth elaborating the nature of conditionality, socialization and lesson drawing. Conditionality is the process of setting conditions by the EU upon third states in return for EU rewards, such as access to the EU internal market, visa facilitation, or EU membership. In the enlargement process, conditionality means the use of EU membership incentive as a tool for achieving

necessary developments/changes in applicant countries. ¹The effectiveness of the conditionality/ external incentive model of EU external governance is conditioned upon four terms: determinacy of conditions, the size and speed of rewards, the credibility of threats and promises, and the size of adoption costs (Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier, 2004: p. 664-667).

Conditionality is not confined within enlargement. It goes beyond the accession process. The EU applies conditionality to third countries in the fields of trade, aid, cooperation agreements and political relations (Grabbe, 2002: p. 251). This enables us to claim that conditionality is a method of EU external influence more than a mechanism of Europeanization. It is also used in conflict resolution as a method of influencing the conflicting parties.

Contrary to conditionality, socialization and lesson-drawing are two sub-processes of Europeanization based on interaction. The success of lesson-drawing and much more socialization depends on consistence, closeness and heaviness of interactions. Conditionality is different from socialization and lesson-drawing in two ways: it is not a process but applied, and it occurs in the short term. It is a method of conducting external relations. However, the 'bringabouts' of conditionality - changes made in legal and administrative structures of institutions, law and domestic policies of a country - are left hanging in the air without any definition. A new definition for changes brought by conditionality may stand in the same line with socialization and lesson-drawing (Nasibov 2012).

In this part of the paper, different variants of Europeanization identified by Olsen, Harmsen and Wilson were analyzed and the mosaic of the concept of Europeanization was constructed, and its advantages were briefly elaborated. Another important finding of this section was about the claimed mechanisms of Europeanization.

CONCLUSION

This paper has given an account of the mosaic of the concept of Europeanization. This project was undertaken to bring some clarification to the literature concerning Europeanization in which a wide range of phenomena is referred to by this term.

¹ The Copenhagen European Council decision sets three conditions for EU membership:

- Stability of institutions, guaranteeing democracy, the rule of law, human rights and respect for and protection of minorities,
- The existence of a functioning market economy as well as the capacity to cope with the competitive pressure and market forces within the Union.
- Ability to take on the obligation of membership including adherence to the aims of political, economic and monetary union (1993).

Taking the traditional line regarding the issue of a mega conception of Europeanization, a mosaic of the concept of Europeanization was chosen as solution to the vagueness in the literature. Two statements were adopted before moving on to the discussions. (i) Europeanization is not restricted to the EU and did not begin with that. (ii) Today it is more and more dependent on the EU. In other words, EU actions and its presence constitute the source of Europeanization. The trade-offs in research design in Europeanization were taken into account as well.

First, a line was drawn between the concept of Europeanization and the conception of the concept of Europeanization. The difference between concept and conception, the possibility of having the concept without having the complete conception and the reason for having different conceptions of a concept were elaborated. It was noted that the main reason for having different conceptions of a concept is the variety of knowledge accepted as identifying. Subsequently, a line was drawn between the concept and conception in the study of Europeanization. Applied in the case of Europeanization, the reason for the emergence of such a wide range of variants of the concept is that different aspects of Europeanization were taken as identifying knowledge. In addition, there was an unintended finding in the first chapter. The question of a certain normative aspect involved in possessing the concept of Europeanization was also raised.

Next, the variants of Europeanization identified by Olsen, Harmsen and Wilson were elaborated in the second chapter of this article. The identifying knowledge of each of these different variants of the concept of Europeanization was analyzed, and the mosaic of the concept of Europeanization was constructed. The aspects of the mosaic of the concept of Europeanization were drawn from among the entities of the variants of the concept of Europeanization identified by the authors mentioned above. They are the following: adaptation in institutional structures and policy-making processes; convergence in substantive policy areas; development of institutions at the European level and power sharing among supranational, national and subnational levels; socialization of institutions; redefinition of conceptions; and reconstruction of identity and discourse. The main principle in defining the aspects was to achieve the maximum practicality of the mosaic. To this end, some variants of the concept such as modernization, transnationalism and cultural integration were ignored. As a result, each of the six aspects of the mosaic of the concept of Europeanization has high applicability.

The achievements made in the previous discussions enabled us to focus on the differentiation of Europeanization from European integration and EU external governance. With this purpose, the question of the mechanisms of Europeanization was addressed. Five mechanisms suggested by Grabbe, and those provided by

Coppieters, *etal.*, and Schimmelfennig and Sedelmeier were examined. The conclusion was made that by accepting the existence of the mechanisms of Europeanization, Europeanization as a policy conducted and dominated by the EU is also accepted implicitly. Nonetheless, the social aspects of the mosaic of the concept of Europeanization exclude such a possibility. If those special aspects are excluded from the list, then no difference remains between Europeanization and European integration. Thus, the difference between Europeanization and European integration was elucidated to some extent.

To explore the differences between Europeanization and EU external governance, it was initially noted that while EU external governance concerns the relations of the EU with third countries, the concept of Europeanization involves transformation both within and outside the EU. Furthermore, the mechanisms of EU external governance – conditionality, socialization and lesson-drawing-- were analyzed. It was concluded that contrary to conditionality, socialization and lesson-drawing are two sub-processes of Europeanization based on interaction. The success of lesson-drawing and much more socialization depends on consistence, closeness and heaviness of interactions. Conditionality is different from socialization and lesson-drawing in two ways: it is not a process but applied, and it occurs in the short term. It is a method of conducting external relations. Thus, the differences between Europeanization and EU external governance and European integration were emphasized, and the relationship between socialization and lesson-drawing and Europeanization was clarified.

Taken together, these results suggest that that the mosaic of the concept of Europeanization has brought more practicality, more concrete aspects with high applicability and clarification to the relationships between itself and two other concepts – European integration and EU external governance.

Despite its achievements, this paper is not free from limitations. While working on this paper, little attention was given to and no mention was made of the theory of European integration, which could make a valuable contribution to the paper. Furthermore, the current study has only examined the usages of Europeanization determined by Olsen, Harmsen and Wilson.

This research has introduced many questions in need of further investigation. Further work needs to be done to establish whether there a certain normative aspect of the concept can be suggested. Could it be its transforming characteristic? If the debate is to be moved forward, new ways of increasing practicality should be addressed. It would also be interesting to apply all the aspects in one case and achieve new findings.

REFERENCES AND NOTES:

- Barbe, E., et al. 2009. "Which rules shape EU external governance? Patterns of Rule Selection in Foreign and Security Policies". *Journal of European Public Policy*16:6, pp. 834-852
- Coppieters, B. et al. 2004. "Europeanization and Conflict Resolution". Gent: Academia Press
- Ezcurdia, M., 1998. "The Concept-Conception Distinction", *Philosophical Issues*9, pp. 187-192
- Grabbe, H., 2001. "How does Europeanization affect CEE governance? Conditionality, diffusion and diversity". *Journal of European Public Policy*8:6
- Grabbe, H., 2002. "European Union conditionality and Acquis Communautaire", *International Political Science Review*23, No. 3, 249–268
- Harmsen, R., and Wilson, T., 2000. "Introduction: Approaches to Europeanization", *Yearbook of European Studies*14, pp. 13-26
- Lavenex, S. and Lehmkuhl, D. and Whichmann, N. 2009. "Modes of external governance: a cross-national and cross-sectoral comparison". *Journal of European Public Policy*16:6, pp. 813-833
- Lavenex, S., 2008 "A governance perspective on the European neighbourhood policy: integration beyond conditionality?". *Journal of European Public Policy*15:6, pp. 938-955
- Lavenex, S., and Schimmelfennig, F., 2009. "EU rules beyond EU borders: theorizing external governance in European Politics". *Journal of European Public Policy* 16:6,791-812
- Nasibov, M., 2012. "To what extent is the EU an effective conflict resolution actor? Cases of Macedonia and Georgia". LAP Lambert Academic Publishing
- Olsen, J., 2002. "The Many Faces of Europeanization," *Journal of Common Market Studies* 40 5: 921-952
- Schimmelfennig, F., and Sedelmeier, U., 2004. "Governance by conditionality: EU rule transfer to the candidate countries of Central and Eastern Europe". *Journal of European Public Policy* 11:4, 661-679

Summary

A Mosaic Of The Concept Of Europeanization? (*Broad but practical*)

Murad Nasibov

Centre for Social Policy Development,
Baku, Azerbaijan

There has been a dramatic increase in the number of papers written on the concept Europeanization in the last two decades. However, there is no prevailing conception of Europeanization. Nor, there has been any discussion about the mosaic of the concept Europeanization. By introducing the mosaic of the concept Europeanization, the aim of this paper was to bring more practicality, concreteness and clarification to the literature on Europeanization. In a result, the mosaic of the concept of Europeanization with six aspects was constructed. These aspects were drawn from among the entities of the variants of the concept Europeanization discussed above. Furthermore, distinctions between on the one hand, Europeanization and on the other hand, European integration and EU external governance were identified. Taken together, these results suggest that the mosaic of the concept Europeanization has brought more practicality, more concrete aspects with high applicability and clarification to the relationships between itself and other two concepts – European integration and EU external governance.

Key words: Europeanization, European integration, EU external governance